

1984

Women in educational administration: Barriers/strategies

Gail Ladria Dozier
University of Northern Iowa

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©1984 Gail Ladria Dozier

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Dozier, Gail Ladria, "Women in educational administration: Barriers/strategies" (1984). *Graduate Research Papers*. 2181.

<https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp/2181>

This Open Access Graduate Research Paper is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Work at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Research Papers by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

Women in educational administration: Barriers/strategies

Abstract

Women historically have played a significant role in American education, but their role almost exclusively has been in teaching positions. Women have been excluded from authority positions within the educational system as throughout the society. Although women comprise over two-thirds of the teacher population, men dominate the positions of school administration.

WOMEN IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION:
BARRIERS/STRATEGIES

A Research Paper
Presented to
The Department of Educational Administration
and Counseling
University of Northern Iowa

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
Gail Ladria Dozier
December 1984

This Research Paper by: GAIL LADRIA DOZIER

Entitled: WOMEN IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION:

BARRIERS/STRATEGIES

has been approved as meeting the research paper requirement
for the Degree of Master of Arts.

Norman McCumsey

12/4/84
Date Approved

Director of Research Paper

Robert Krajewski

12/5/84
Date Approved

Second Reader of Research Paper

Norman McCumsey

12/4/84
Date Received

Graduate Faculty Advisor

Robert Krajewski

12/5/84
Date Received

Head, Department of Educational
Administration and Counseling

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
1.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem	3
	Importance of the Study	3
	Definition of Terms	4
2.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	6
	Leadership Skills of Women Administrators	6
	Sex Discrimination	9
	Sex Role Stereotyping	13
	Strategies	19
	Strategies for Institutions	20
	Strategies for Women	30
3.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	36
	Summary	36
	Conclusions	37
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	39

Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

Women historically have played a significant role in American education, but their role almost exclusively has been in teaching positions. Women have been excluded from authority positions within the educational system as throughout the society. Although women comprise over two-thirds of the teacher population, men dominate the positions of school administration.

According to a 1981-1982 national survey conducted by the American Association of School Administrators (ASSA), only twenty-five percent of all school administrators were women. Only two percent of all superintendents, nine percent of all associative deputy and assistant superintendents, and sixteen percent of all principals were women. The principalship is frequently regarded as a "stepping-stone" to higher administration. Since women occupy so few principalships, they also account for very few of the higher central positions.

It has been argued that the reason for the lack of women in positions of authority is not due to male bias, but rather that women are not qualified to hold positions of leadership (Fishel & Pottker, 1974). Many studies attempted to justify the disproportion of women in administration. Researchers examined leadership behaviors and personality characteristics of men and women principals to assess their effectiveness.

Investigators studying women principals found that their overall leadership and administrative capabilities rated by supervisors and subordinates were greater than (Van Meir, 1973) or equal to those of male principals (Smith, 1977). Morsink (1970) revealed in a study that on certain dimensions of leader behavior, men and women were not perceived by their subordinates to behave in a significantly different manner. This indicated that there was no justification in the argument that men behave more appropriately than women as secondary principals. On the basis of evidence in a study by Johnson (1977) to test the relationship among rule administration behavior and leadership behavior, it was concluded that there was nothing to support the notion that women should not be utilized as elementary school principals.

The findings of a study by Berman (1982) revealed that the task performance behavior of a principal seemed to be determined by the nature of the principalship rather than by the sex of the principal. This suggested that the assumption made about administration being a "man's job" had no validity. Data gathered in a study by Arons (1980) added to existing evidence that women possess as much administrative potential as men.

Given that research has reported evidence of equal capabilities between men and women administrators, and potential administrators, it is necessary to examine the practices and programs of the educational system and identify

the major barriers that hinder women's progress into administrative positions, and the strategies to overcome these barriers.

Statement of the Problem

The number of women in school administration is disproportionate to the number of women in the teaching profession. Laws and court rulings have not improved the relationship of women in educational administration to a more nearly equal representation with men. The statistics alone call for renewal efforts to improve the position of women in administration. Too few women are being hired into administrative positions.

The purpose of this study was to identify the major barriers to the progress of women in educational administration, and to develop a synthesis of the strategies to overcome these barriers, thus increasing the percentage of women in the field.

Importance of the Study

Putting women in leadership positions will not automatically solve all the problems facing education. However, there are at least two well-documented reasons supporting the need for more women in administration. Fishel & Pottker (1975) found that schools headed by women principals achieved: 1) greater student performance and involvement and 2) greater parental and community involvement. Therefore

women in leadership positions would provide a strong impetus to the effective schooling process.

Because women should have equal access to all positions for which they have equal qualifications, it is important that women and men in education understand the barriers that hinder the advancement of women into administrative positions. Women who wish to advance should be able to anticipate and plan strategies to overcome those barriers. Institutions, state and local boards, schools of education, and professional organizations should strive to implement strategies to promote an environment in which women are included in the administrative career process.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following terms will be used as defined by the Random House Dictionary of English Usage (1981), Jess Stein, Editor in Chief.

Affirmative Action. Encouragement for increased representation of women and minority-group members in employment.

Bias. A perceived opinion about something or someone.

Equity. The quality of being fair or impartial in the application of general principles.

Racism. A set of attitudes and beliefs that races have distinctive characteristics that determine their cultures, usually involving the idea that one's own race is superior and has the right to rule others.

Sex Discrimination. Practices of custom, habit or law which make distinctions in favor of or against one sex.

Sex Stereotyping. Expecting certain behaviors and occupations based only on a person's sex.

Sexism. Discrimination against women (in its original sense). It has been coined to denote discrimination based on gender.

Chapter Two

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

"Throughout American history, the role of women in education has been imbalanced and filled with obstacles" (Loomis, 1978, p. 1). Women have always been underrepresented in educational administration. Research studies have sought to delineate social, psychological, and institutional factors which are perceived to limit women's opportunities for advancement (Dublon, 1983).

This review of the literature examined the sociopsychological attitudes and the discriminatory practices which hinder the advancement of women in educational administration, and compiled strategies to overcome these barriers.

Leadership Skills of Women Administrators

Competency should be the criterion for placing an individual in any position. Is the lack of women in educational administration due to the fact that women administrators are less competent than men? Evidence indicates that quite the opposite is true (Seawell & Canady, 1974).

In Smith's (1977) study, more than two-thirds of the superintendents rated the women principals' knowledge of the curriculum as good or excellent. With regard to building climate and encouraging creativity in students and staff,

two-thirds of the superintendents rated the women principals as either good or excellent. The superintendents were asked to respond to items that were related to the women's ability to perceive problems and analyze the situations, act, evaluate the results of their acts, and learn from their experiences. In all of these aspects, the women were found to be good or excellent by a majority of the superintendents that employed them. In the areas of human relations and leadership, the women were again rated as either good or excellent. The only area in which a majority of the superintendents did not find the women to be either good or excellent was the women's knowledge of budget preparation.

Morsink (1970) found that on certain dimensions of leader behavior, men and women were not perceived by their subordinates to behave in a significantly different manner. Male principals outscored women principals on only one dimension of leadership behavior: tolerance of freedom. Since the findings revealed that female principals received higher scores on all other dimensions of leader behavior, Morsink stated that there was no justification for the argument that men behaved more appropriately than women as secondary school principals. Men might be preferred if appropriate leadership means a person having a greater tolerance of freedom. Women might be preferred if appropriate leadership means a person who more often acts and speaks as a group representative, is persuasive in argument, emphasizes

production, maintains cordial relationships with superiors, and has influence over superiors.

Hoyle (1969) conducted a study that compared the manner in which male and female principals made decisions or solved problems. Teachers indicated that female principals were better able to recognize potential problems and evaluate the results of action significantly more often than male principals.

In studying the managerial behavior of principals, Berman (1982) revealed that task performance behavior seemed to be determined by the nature of the principalship rather than by the sex of the principal. The findings indicated that male and female principals' overall task performances were similar, especially in such areas as types and duration of different activities and pace and volume of workload. However, female principals had higher percentages of contacts initiated by others, shorter desk work sessions during the school day (but longer sessions after school hours), higher percentages of contacts with superiors, longer phone calls and meetings, and more likelihood of carrying out cooperative planning during meetings. It was concluded that the assumption which had been made about administration being a "man's job" had no validity.

The results of an investigation by Johnson (1977) to test the relationship among rule administration (how

principals administer rules) and leadership behavior and the sex of Black elementary school principals revealed that female principals were perceived, by their teachers, as more representative and more punishment-centered than male principals in their administration of the rules. In terms of leader behavior, the women were rated higher than the men in structure, role assumption, production emphasis, predictive accuracy, integration, and superior orientation. Johnson concluded that there was nothing to support the notion that, in terms of leader behavior, Black females should not be utilized as elementary school principals.

Sex Discrimination

Research indicated that there is little, if any, significant evidence to support the notion that men are better suited for leadership and educational administration than women. Sexual discrimination has played an important role and has been evidenced over a period of time in the selection of candidates to administrative positions (Van Meir, 1975).

The results from attitudinal studies indicated that there was prejudice shown by most male teachers, school superintendents, and school board members against women serving as principals. Owens (1975) found that superintendents and men principals did not believe that women wanted to be school administrators. They also believed that parents and communities preferred male principals.

The criteria used to recruit and hire principals was not related to characteristics needed for effective performance as principals. Sex had been the determinant in the appointment to principalship, rather than ability. Although behavioral evidence indicated that in many areas female principals were as competent as male principals, male teachers continued to receive the overwhelming number of appointments to administrative positions (Fishel & Pottker, 1975).

The observations presented suggest that competent persons are being overlooked in the selection of educational administrators. Two things are apparent: 1) women perform equally as well in the positions of principalships as do men, and 2) they are not being selected on the same basis as men to fill these jobs. "Personnel administrators and school board members who believe that competence and performance are the primary criteria for employment in any position would do well to reassess their decisions about employing women as principals" (Seawell & Canady, 1974, p. 48). It would seem that in light of the accumulating evidence, boards of education and superintendents should avoid discrimination on the basis of sex and look instead for the personal qualities and administrative skills that are needed in the particular leadership job to be filled (Hoyle, 1969).

Why are so few women employed in educational administration? Scores of surveys produced for education

organizations and commissions in the last dozen years conclude that the answer is discrimination of four general kinds as observed by Elizabeth Koontz (Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor):

Legal discrimination by which the legislation once used for their protection can be used now to deny them jobs . . . educational discrimination that has denied women equal access to vocational training, business schools, and graduate schools . . . economic discrimination by which women are not given equal consideration for jobs, job training, or advancement . . . psychological discrimination by which women are conditioned to believe that they were never meant to aspire very high and that inequality is the natural state of affairs. (Krohn, 1974, p. 34)

Civil rights legislation traditionally has prohibited discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin, but it was not until 1969 that "minorities" was defined to include women. As a result, much federal legislation has been amended explicitly to include non-discriminatory features based on either sex or education.

Rather than one all-inclusive pre-packaged piece of legislation, the current effective legislation regarding equal employment opportunities for women in public education systems had developed bit by bit over a decade. To fully comprehend the letter and spirit of the laws, one must seek to relate parts of the Equal Pay Act of 1963, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Executive Order 11246 (1965) and its 1967 sequel, Title I of the Civil Rights Act of 1968, Order No. 4 on Affirmative Action Program (1970), Title IX of the Education Amendment Act of 1972 (Higher Education Act), and the Equal Employment Opportunities Act of 1972. Only when the pertinent parts of this, and other, legislation are inserted in the context of equal employment opportunities for women in public school districts can the weight of the legislation be felt. (Pallante & Hilton, 1977, p. 207)

Title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972 reads, "No person in the United States shall on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance. . ." Title IX is the broadest and most comprehensive of the sex discrimination laws. The interpretation of the law and its enforcement is within the jurisdiction of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (Dale, 1974).

Other laws that specifically protect women are:

1. Amendments to the Equal Pay Act and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act allow women to recover any wages lost because of discriminatory practices.

2. The Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution states: "No person shall . . . deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

3. The Womens Educational Equity Act provides grants and contracts to fund wide-ranging series of programs for increasing the role of women. The Act states:

Sec. 193 (b) (1) The Congress finds and declares that educational programs in the United States, as presently conducted, are frequently inequitable as such programs relate to women and frequently limit the full participation of all individuals in American society.

Sec. 931 (b) (2) It is the purpose of this part to provide educational equity for women in the United States and to provide financial assistance to enable educational agencies and institutions to meet the requirements of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. (Shubert, 1983, p. 1)

The Equal Rights Amendment has been proposed to the legislature. This amendment would guarantee that equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged because of sex.

Sex Role Stereotyping

During the 1960's and 70's various factors influenced a slow but steady shift in the thinking of women regarding their status in society. The Civil Rights Movement and the proposed Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) have contributed to a changing self-image for women and a questioning of the old order (Peters, 1980). "Women in the 1970's found that equality of the sexes in the public school system and in administration was a legislated reality but that the practice was far more an illusion than a reality" (Loomis, 1978, p. 1).

A thorough understanding of the nature of discrimination, as well as the legal means to combat it, are vital tools for women seeking administrative positions. Although considerable progress has been made in changing laws, women have not obtained their legal rights (Gordon & Ball, 1979). Major obstacles still challenge women in their plight up the educational administration hierarchy.

McDonald (1975) concluded from a survey of women elementary classroom teachers, assistant principals and principals that:

1. The interrelationship between the career and family roles of women was not a significant factor accounting for

the underrepresentation of women in administrative positions in the field of elementary education. This conclusion appears to contradict the widely held assumption that women do not seek leadership roles in the labor force due to a conflict between their home and job responsibilities.

2. Perceived sex discrimination toward a person occupying a leadership role in the field of elementary education was not a significant factor accounting for the underrepresentation of women in administrative positions. This conclusion contradicts the widely held assumption that women do not seek leadership roles because they feel men are preferred in such positions.

Contrary to other studies, Kalvelage (1978) rejected both sex discrimination and incompetence as explanations for the lack of women in educational administration. She traced clues to the decline of women in administration to the decline of the feminist support system that occurred after women won the vote, to state laws for equal pay for equal work, and to the "cult of efficiency" that led to the bureaucratization of schools. She stated that the bureaucratization of schools entailed a redefinition of the elementary principal's role that clashed with the values and interests of most women.

The findings from a survey by Coffin and Ekstrom (1979) were in general agreement with earlier research. The main factors found to be barriers to the hiring of women

administrators were discrimination and attitudes of both the women and the hiring authority about appropriate roles for women. The evidence suggested that the hiring authorities held the kinds of prejudicial attitudes and beliefs about women administrators that were described by Fishel and Pottker (1975). The behavior evidenced by the authors indicated that in terms of ability to supervise and administer a school, and to maintain good relations with students and parents, the few women who were able to obtain administrative positions performed as capably as, if not more capably than their male counterparts.

Top level women administrators in a study by Benton (1980) stated that discrimination on the basis of sex had not hindered their careers. Cultural conditioning of men and women to conform to sex-role stereotypes was overwhelmingly cited as the primary reason few women hold administrative positions in public community colleges. The top level administrators believed that the lack of administrative and educational preparation was a result of society's sex-role stereotyping since women have not sought out administrative opportunities and men have not traditionally offered administrative opportunities to women.

The major obstacles identified by women secondary principals to the promotion of women in a study by Davis and Rodes (1980) were prejudice against women, personal obligations, deficiencies in experience and training

opportunities and lack of job opportunities. Other obstacles named were age, personal style, too few candidates, and acculturated attitudes of women and men.

Jackson (1980) found that there was no sex role conflict in the handling of home and career responsibilities of the women superintendents studied. These women attributed weaknesses unique to women in administration primarily to socialization and cultural expectations. The barriers identified by women superintendents in Costa's (1981) study were attributed to their sex and/or lack of confidence.

In a study investigating the perceptions of women aspiring to positions of higher educational administration, Bickel (1980) reported that women perceived conflicts created by attempts to balance career, marriage, and family; lack of female role models; and the inability to penetrate the "old boys network" as barriers. The women, as a group, did not perceive most barriers identified in the survey as affecting most women. However, they did believe that barriers have more of an effect on women than on men.

Martin (1980) attempted to study minority women in higher education and their perceptions of internal, external, structural and racial barriers. The majority of women did not perceive the existence of internal, external, or structural barriers. They did, however, perceive the presence of racial barriers. The three barriers that

minority women perceived hindered their career were: racism, sexism, and parent's financial resources.

Rometo (1983) surveyed women administrators and their superintendents. The barriers they most often cited as hindering recruitment and promotion into administration were discrimination against women, the lack of administrative openings, time scheduling, financial problems, job/home conflicts, lack of acceptance in male social administrative situations, resentment from subordinates and peers, and sex role stereotyping.

Scrizzi (1983) identified characteristics of selected women in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts who overcame factors identified in the literature as contributing to the underrepresentation of women in key administrative positions in vocational education. The respondents all reported that they overcame barriers previously identified. External barriers encountered included: prejudice among members of local school committees, infractions of the Educational Amendments of 1972, and occupational stereotyping. Types of discrimination encountered included direct discrimination as evidenced by separate salary schedules for men and women and sexual harrasment.

The respondents reported that internal barriers did not significantly hinder their career goals and achievements. Neither sex socialization or sex role stereotyping affected upward career mobility of the women studied.

Campbell (1982) suggested that perhaps the greatest obstacles to obtaining administrative positions are tradition, and the persistence of stereotypes of women in leadership roles. For Black women, the problems are compounded--making it double discrimination (on the basis of sex and race).

Discrimination, low aspirations, and attitudes about women's roles should not be viewed as being distant entities. All of these stem from the sex-role stereotyping which results in socialization which produces women who have limited aspirations and difficulty in dealing with role ambiguities and conflict. This socialization also produces men who hold inaccurate attitudes and expectations about women's competencies (Coffin & Ekstrom, 1979). The field of education is little different from society as a whole, which typically rewards men with administrative, supervisory, and policy-making posts in most professions and occupations (Krohn, 1974).

Peters (1980) noted that American public education has been based on a patriarchal system. The expectations of the patriarchal system have been that women are suited to the more maternal, nurturing, teaching roles, while men are suited to the more dominant, authoritative, administrative roles. Women have been traditionally oriented from childhood to take a rather passive, secondary role toward men in parental, sibling, marital, and occupational roles. This role arrangement fulfilled the expectations of the school

system while ignoring the prevailing needs of the individual.

Sexual separatism is the foundation for sex-role stereotyping which can do the most damage to future aspirations and expectations. One way to achieve sex equity is to eliminate sex-role stereotyping early in life (Sex Equity in Educational Leadership, 1977).

Students absorb ideas and assess reality from the immediate environment of the school. The lack of women in administrative roles affects the education provided for boys and girls within the classroom. Role modeling is a powerful form of learning. Students who never experience women in leadership positions, or men working with young children, are not likely to develop aspirations or values that move beyond traditional stereotypes (Howard, 1975).

Strategies

The number of women in educational administration is disproportionate to the number of women in the teaching profession despite official efforts to end sex discrimination. Women are hampered on the way to obtaining an adequate education, finding roadblocks from sex bias in elementary readers to discrimination in graduate programs; they are considered responsible for home and children even when working full time, are not expected to aspire to administrative positions, and are assumed to be inferior to men who seek administrative jobs. Once hired, women are

given little support from male superiors. While behavioral research generally favors women in administrative roles, attitudinal studies continue to show a preference for males. In order for those attitudes to change, and female students to be given adequate role models for their own resistance to sex stereotyping, women must be placed in administrative roles. To encourage acceptance of women in such positions requires getting more women into the field and changing sexist attitudes (Pawlitschck, 1976).

The opportunity and responsibility for initiating these changes are interrelated and require action at national, state, and local levels. Both public schools and colleges must work in conjunction with all other institutions to eradicate inequality in education. Change should be made in the formal preparation programs, informal socialization procedures, and continuing professional growth programs. These recommended strategies, if implemented, should help serve to eradicate sexist attitudes and increase levels of aspirations of women, thus removing the barriers which discourage women from pursuing careers in educational administration.

Strategies for Institutions

In an updated study of Academic Women by Jessie Bernard published in 1964, Simeone (1983) investigated the changes of status of faculty women within American higher education over the past two decades. The following issues were addressed:

1) representation within fields and institutions, 2) measures of formal status, 3) involvement in teaching versus research, 4) participation in formal networks, and 5) effects of marital and family status. Results showed that on each measure, the status of women had not changed significantly since 1964, despite the women's movement and affirmative actions. Women continue to comprise less than one quarter of all academic personnel within certain fields and types of institutions. They are perceived by others within the constraints of stereotypically female roles, and are excluded from informal networks of communication with male colleagues. They are more disadvantaged than men by their marital and family status, lacking the institutional supports which men receive. The greatest areas of change have been in the increase in number of female graduate students and newly-hired faculty; the creation of laws and institutional policies, intended to ensure equity for women; the growth of women studies and feminist scholarship; and professional and support networks.

Litigation is one direct strategy for remedying discriminatory hiring and promotion practices. The record on women in educational administration shows that internal roadblocks are trivial compared with the external barriers to women's success--the old boy networks, the stereotypes and fears men (and other women) have of women seeking administrative positions, and the absence of affirmative action policies.

Surprisingly, school system employment policies concerning women administrators largely have been unchallenged and untested under civil rights law. School systems inadvertently have been protected under Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, which does not require affirmative action policies (as does Title VII of the Civil Rights Act). Title IX has been the all-inclusive legislation by which race and sex discrimination in education programs, student enrollment, and personnel policies are prohibited in public schools. Enforcement, however, primarily has focused on programs and rights, not discrimination in employment. (Shapiro, 1984, p. 45)

In order to examine implementation of affirmative action policies at doctorate-granting universities, Hyer (1983), through on-site interviewing of faculty and administrators, and document reviews, discovered the strategies, policies, programs, and other factors that were associated with positive change for women at three successful institutions. Commitment of top administrators was a crucial factor in successful affirmative action implementation. A vital aspect of leader commitment was the creation and support of effective affirmative action staff roles. Women's groups also played an important role in pressuring for change. Federal intervention mobilized leaders at the point of policy adoption, but had little effect on implementation. All three campuses monitored faculty appointments closely and gave affirmative action issues high administrative priority.

Under the Womens Educational Equity Act, five institutions received contracts in 1980 to implement a comprehensive program of educational equity in a local education agency:

1. The University of Tennessee - PROJECT NEED
2. The NETWORK Inc. - PROJECT INTERACTION
3. Northwest Regional Education Laboratory - PROJECT EQUITY
4. American Institutes for Research - PROJECT FOCUS
5. The University of Miami - THE NATIONAL SEX EQUITY DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

Each demonstration project was designed to assist educators at all levels to integrate equity concepts in their institutional practices; use materials that contribute to an educational environment free of sex and ethnic bias; offer training to individuals interested in establishing equity programs in their own schools; and collect qualitative and quantitative data bases for judging the extent to which the program achieves its aims.

Stephanz (1979) recommended that Title IX should be strictly enforced. Affirmative action plans should be developed and implemented, and educational employment opportunities should be supported in court actions. School systems should provide internships and other practical methods, emphasizing teamwork and management skills, through which women can be trained for advancement. Noting that women who achieve administrative positions often find themselves in a "token" position, appointment of several women at a time should help avoid tokenism's negative effects.

Mulder (1983) examined the particular life-worlds of women administrators in educational organizations. Specific sections of the study focused on women in an urban school system, including an elementary school principal, an assistant high school principal, an alternative school principal, a central office administrator, and six community college educators; a woman district superintendent in a rural school setting and two college administrators, one in a public university and the other in a private proprietary institution. The study suggested that while women administrators flourish in settings where more of them are in leadership roles, they still experience the dilemma of being outsiders in organizations that are dominated by males.

Loomis (1978) suggested that all professional associations should encourage and support legislation and policy decisions to eliminate sex barriers that may impede highly qualified women from entering certain fields or positions. Publicity should be given to women in school administration. Universities should encourage women to obtain advanced degrees with a goal toward preparing for administration positions and facilitate their continuing study. University professors should encourage women to seek employment in leadership roles in community college administration. And the best administrator from available candidates should be selected regardless of their sex.

It was further suggested that communication techniques and parameters for personal growth and development on the job should be conducted to eradicate current misconceptions that exist regarding the dual-role conflict, advancement possibilities, and professional aspirations of the female administrator. Projects should be developed which analyze and eliminate sexism in existing programs. A Sexism Awareness Task Force Citizen Group was recommended to call attention to the existence of sexist attitudes and to evaluate objectives and goals for the elimination of sexism.

Qualified faculty women who are eligible for administrative positions should be identified. And those women who are presently engaged in administrative positions should be put into more visible leadership roles. One way to identify eligible women is through a Talent Bank. A Talent Bank is a file of resumes of women certified in administration who are looking for administrative positions. It is a resource for administrators who want to be sure that they know of all qualified women applicants. (Smith, 1983)

In order to increase the number of women holding the nontraditional role of formal leadership in the Florida system of vocational education, a 2-week training institute for women teachers was conducted at the University of South Florida, Sarasota Campus. The focus of the workshop was organizational theory and management, sex equity in education, and career exploration. The long-term goal of the

institute is to increase self confidence and motivate women leaders to complete the necessary steps to become certified vocational education administrators (Kimme, 1983).

Recommendations by Pawlitschek (1976) were that inservice training on an on-going basis designed to raise levels of awareness of the contributions and abilities of women should be required. Persons making personnel decisions should be sensitized to how their attitudes on women as professionals affect their decisions. All personnel staff should be trained to use objective, job-related criteria to contribute to efforts of equal opportunity.

Pawlitschek also encouraged increased involvement of women at all levels and in all fields by initiating policy and structural changes. Admission and financial aid policies, and career counseling reevaluation was suggested. Also, half-time appointments with half-time salaries was encouraged to allow women to rear children without an interruption in their professional lives.

The results of a survey conducted by Budig, Hammond and Bailey (1984) on the participation of women in higher education administration programs at seven comprehensive public universities in seven midwestern states indicated that women constituted 45% enrollment in the programs and their job placement was very high. These gains were attributed to the considerable effort by the departments of higher education administration at the universities.

Determined faculty members spent months identifying and actively recruiting prospective female candidates. They offered them at least partial financial assistance and assured them of faculty support in their search for employment after graduation.

Neidig (1980) recommended that the administrative staff support women in training programs. Announcements of job openings should be made available to them at the same time as men. After being accepted into a position, back-up support should be provided to beginning women administrators. And the administrative staff should help develop long-range goals for achieving women's equity in education.

Male administrators can improve their hiring of female administrators by learning to recognize sexist practices, by getting the word out about job openings, and by monitoring the district's compliance with Title IX regulations (Smith, 1983).

Howard (1975) offered the following strategies to school boards:

1. Issue a formal statement opposing discrimination on the basis of sex.
2. Examine and revise policies which support discriminatory practices.
3. Examine the status of the women in comparison to the men to provide a basis for affirmative action plans.
4. Establish annual goals and timetables for the recruitment, selection, and conditions of employment. Use

preferential hiring in areas where one sex is under-utilized, as to work toward the elimination of sex-typing between and within occupations.

5. Make available a procedure for channeling complaints of discrimination by sex.

6. Provide inservice training sessions on stereotyped attitudes and practices to raise the level of awareness of sex discrimination.

School principals are the link between the central administration, the teachers, and departments within the schools. Therefore, their role in achieving sex equity is crucial. While there are many factors that influence the receptivity of a school system to new educational directions, the leadership of the school principal is probably the key influence. The principal, through affirmative leadership, can build an equity network that can make a difference in the quality of the education that students receive. This network consists of teachers, counselors, administrators, and students.

The curriculum is at the heart of the educational process. It is the overall program of learning of the school, and includes all the activities offered to the student. It is the responsibility of the school to ensure that the learning program does not hamper a student's success, self image, or future options because of his/her sex or race. School principals must develop policies that

promote positive images of all students through a broad-based, sex fair multi-cultural curriculum. (Denbo, 1981).

Students should be given equal instruction and support services in all grades. All courses and extra-curricular activities should be open to both sexes. Choices based on interests and talents should be encouraged. In addition, students should be given information about the status of women in the labor force and about the new career opportunities available to them. This would enable students to choose courses with a more realistic view of the work lives of women. Images of girls and women presented in texts for all subjects should be considered when purchasing materials. All texts should be screened for bias (Pawlitschek, 1976).

Some of the recommendations from the Workshop on Sex Roles and Teaching in Junior and High Schools were:

1. Provide meaningful human goals rather than sex stereotyped goals.
2. Nurture human and creative potentials of both girls and boys.
3. Develop personal awareness of students (Sex Equity in Educational Leadership, 1977).

The Sex Equity in Educational Leadership (SEEL) Project in Oregon was designed to develop strategies for achieving sex equity in school administration that could be adopted by other states. These strategies included efforts to change:

1) individual attitudes, behaviors, and understanding; 2) organizational policies and practices; and 3) local school districts' hiring practices.

One strategy to ensure that the system stay attuned to equity issues was a statewide coalition or linking board among existing organizations. The State Advisory Board on Educational Equity was created by SEEL as a method to intervene in the educational system. It was called a linking board because each member was a link to an organization already in existence. The board was composed of prominent individuals with the education system, such as a Dean of Education, Assistant Dean of Education from another university, a superintendent, a district affirmative action officer, a department chair at a third university, the legal specialist in the state department of education, a member of the state educational commission, and the director of the administration association. The board was one attempt to create a legacy of change. It was to assume leadership and economic responsibility and to continue activities to achieve sex equity in education beyond the funding of the SEEL Project (Schmuck, 1983).

Strategies for Women

Women cannot rely on support from others; they themselves must attempt to influence a change in attitude (Pawlitschek, 1976). "Survival dynamics" equip women with the strategies for moving into administrative positions.

Loomis (1978) suggested that women should be encouraged to be aggressive in their fight for administrative roles.

The women administrators in a study by Benton (1979) stressed the development of self. They encouraged other women to become confident in their administrative abilities.

Stephanz (1979) suggested that women train and apply for administrative positions, and join with other women in cooperative professional, political, and social endeavors. A positive, assertive behavior emerges as women begin to look within themselves and to other women for support and feedback (Gordon & Bail, 1977).

One of the most popular strategies for facilitating women into administration is training programs. The programs were founded on the assumption that faculty women needed compensatory education because they were excluded from training experiences which prepared men for administration (Andre & Edwards, 1973). Some of their programs are:

1. Institute for Administrative Advancement (IAA), 1973.
2. Administrative Intern Program for Women in Higher Education (AIP), 1974.
3. Higher Education Resources Services (HERS), 1976.
4. Administrative Skills Program for Women, 1977.
5. ICES (Internship, Certification, Equity, Leadership and Support).

Image building programs were developed in order to improve perceptions of women toward themselves (Peters, 1980).

The National Women's Studies Association (NWSA) is an organization that supports teachers, administrators, and students in Women's Studies Programs as well as those involved in feminist education in the community. The organization has published a handbook of essays and course materials that offers an overview of current practices, models, and concerns (Olson, 1982).

Project AWARE (Assisting Women to Advance through Resources and Encouragement) is funded by the Ford Foundation and established to help women educators climb the administrative ladder. Under the auspices of the American Association of School Administration and the Ford Foundation, a coalition of regional and local organizations have joined together to assist women in this effort. The seven organizations participating in Project AWARE are located throughout the country and provide services to 40 states. All of the centers work to identify qualified women administrators, equip them with skills and know-how basic to administrative strategy, and put them in touch with job openings as they occur (Jones & Montengero, 1978).

The Washington State Association for Administrative Women In Education serves as an advocate for women in educational administration, and encourages and promotes women to enter the field. The Association provides support for women administrators and encourages school systems and educational agencies to employ qualified women as

administrators. The Association also provides a statewide bureau of qualified women in education and works with the Washington State School Directors' Association and local school boards who have prime responsibility for hiring and other educational policies (Smith, 1983).

The National Identification Program for Women Administrators is conducted by the American Council on Education, Office of Women. This program has established over 40 statewide coordinating committees of and for women administrators to provide a networking function in terms of job opportunities and career needs.

Holt (1981) suggested that membership in networks is essential for women who wish to advance in administration. "Networks give people access to significant information and to opportunities for career advancement" (p. 22). However, she stated that the single most important factor in an administrator's career development may be "mentors."

A mentor is a wise or trusted teacher, counselor, and sponsor, and is usually a person of greater experience or seniority in the occupational field a person is entering:

1. The mentor acts as a teacher to enhance the protege's skills and development.
2. The mentor acts as a sponsor to facilitate the protege's entry and advancement in the profession.
3. The mentor may be host and guide, welcoming the protege into a new occupational world and its values, customs, resources, and people.
4. The mentor may be an example that the protege can admire and seek to emulate.
5. The mentor may be a counselor and provide moral support in times of distress. (Smith, 1983, p. 28)

Mentors can open doors, initiate contacts, and make recommendations for new administrators. Female mentors are scarce.

Villani (1983) explored the relationship between mentors and mentees in educational administration. In the study, mentees observed a correlation between their success in overcoming internal and external barriers and their mentoring relationship. The support and encouragement by mentors was considered to be the key contribution of the mentor.

Some women must balance their career and family responsibilities and devise strategies by which conflicts between the various roles can be resolved. The majority of women doctoral students in higher educational administration in a study by Dublon (1983) reported "structural role definition" (an alteration of the external, structurally imposed expectations held by others, regarding appropriate behavior) as their most likely strategy for conflict resolutions. Women administrators interviewed by Villadsen (1979) identified strategies for home/career management. They suggested that women distinguish between "home time" and "work time" to ensure the smooth operation of home and career responsibilities.

Al Rouseau, Assistant Superintendent for Personnel, Beaverton, Oregon, made the following suggestions for women at the Sex Equity in Leadership Conference:

1. Consider and be honest with yourself about your motivations whether it is money, prestige, value to education, etc.

2. Think about the direction you want to go--the level, the speciality, the building level.

3. Consider how flexible you are in district or geographical setting.

4. Get training and certification.

5. Make your interests known to your principal or supervisor.

6. Make your interests known to your district.

7. Be visible at the district level.

8. Build an impressive file.

9. Be alert to openings and don't be afraid to apply (Sex Equity in Educational Leadership, 1977).

Smith (1983) suggested that women who are interested in administration should:

1. Be assertive.

2. Be prepared.

3. Be productive.

4. Be knowledgeable.

Chapter Three

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The lack of women in educational administration has been attributed to many obstacles. Internal and external barriers exist for women who wish to advance. External barriers, those emanating from the society and its institutions, are seen to be more serious obstacles to advancement than internal barriers.

The interaction between individual socialization patterns and the norms of the larger society tend to reinforce differentiated sex roles. The level of aspiration for women to pursue administrative positions may be attributed to the socialization and the awareness of women that opportunities in administration are limited for them due to discriminatory hiring and promotion policies.

Even though Federal legislation has mandated an end to discrimination based on sex, traditional stereotypes continue to influence recruitment and selection decisions. Affirmative Action plans have been developed to help eradicate "discriminatory thinking," and to increase opportunities for women to advance into administrative positions.

Many programs have been developed to change the stereotyped misconceptions about the incompetency of women as administrators. Programs have been sought to provide concepts of social equality. Efforts to end sex role

stereotyping have been made by analyzing and assessing sex equity in educational materials, and role relationships of boys and girls in the classroom.

Other programs have been designed to make attitudinal changes in women by revising their self concepts. These programs also help women to understand the nature of the barriers that hinder their advancement into administration, as well as the legal strategies to combat them.

Conclusions

This review of the literature indicates the need to implement strategies for achieving equity in educational administration. The recommended strategies should be implemented at all levels in order for women to advance into administrative positions.

The judiciary, the legislature, and the executive branches of government should take a positive stand on the issue of sexual discrimination. Title IX should be strictly enforced. Affirmative action plans should not only be developed, but thoroughly implemented. Educational employment opportunities should be mandated and supported in court actions. An on-going investigation within all institutions should determine which strategies are most effective in achieving a more equitable environment for the advancement of women.

Women administrators, as well as women who aspire to become administrators, must know themselves, have confidence

in their abilities, seek and give help, and be prepared for obstacles. Women need to learn about strategies which will help them to view themselves as leaders, and take positive steps to gain control over their professional lives.

Teachers should strive to combat sexism in the classrooms. Perhaps, then a new definition of leadership will emerge among the next generation of youth and young adults; a redefining of the "gender-typed" limitations which have restricted the advancement of women in educational administration.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andre, R., & Edwards, M. I. (1979). Training women for administration. Journal of NAWDAC, 12-18. (Reprint). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 191 342).
- Arak', C. T. (1982, October). Leadership study in Hawaii-- How characteristics of principals affect the school. NASSP Bulletin, 66(456), 88-89.
- Arons, E. L. (1980, December). Male and female administrative potential--Is there a difference? NASSP Bulletin, 64(440), 5-8.
- Barnes, T. (1976). America's forgotten minority: Women school administrators. NASSP Bulletin, 60(339), 87-93.
- Barnes, T. (1974). The status of women in administration. Association of Secondary School Administration.
- Benton, S. Y. (1980), Summer). Women administrators for the 1980's: A new breed. Journal of the NAWDAC, 43 (4), 3. (Reprint UMI).
- Berman, J. S. (1982). The managerial behavior of female high school principals: Implications for training. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the AERA NY, NY March 19-23, 1982. Abstracted from Doctoral Dissertations, Teachers College, Columbia University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 217 516).

- Berry, M. C. (Ed.). (1979). Women in higher educational administration: A book of readings. Available from National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors. Collected Works (022), Opinion Papers (120). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 191 342).
- Bickel, S. L. (1981, June). Female aspirants to higher education administration: Barriers anticipated, strategies utilized (University of Northern Colorado, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41(12), 4896A-4897A.
- Budig, G. A.; Hammond, M. F.; & Bailey, J. D. (1984, May). The place of women in departments of higher education administration. Phi Delta Kappan, 65(9), 625.
- Campbell, V. (1983, February). Making it despite double discrimination. Educational Leadership, 39(5), 337-38.
- Cirinciore-Colno, K. (1975, Winter). The administrator male or female? Journal of Teacher Education, 26(4), 236-37.
- Cochran, J. (1980). When the principal is a woman. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 184 247).
- Coffin, G. C., & Ekstrom, R. B. (1979). Roadblocks to women's careers in educational administration. Journal of NAWDAC. (Reprint). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 191 342).

- Costa, M. E. (1981, November). A descriptive study of women superintendents of public schools in the United States (Columbia University Teachers College). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42(5), 1869A.
- Dole, C. T. (1974, June). Let's open district doors to female administrators. Nation's Schools, 93(6), 12-16.
- Davis, M. M., & Rodes, M. A. (1980, December). Women administrators of public secondary schools in three West Coast states: Their strengths and skills and other factors that have impact on promotion as perceived by four critical groups (Seattle University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41(6), 2370A.
- Dawson, F. L. (1980, December). Women and minorities in the principalship: Career opportunities and problems. NASSP Bulletin, 64(440), 18-28.
- Denbo, S. (1980, June). A school principal's guide to incentive to promote educational equity for girls and boys. Final Report Ellis Associate, Inc., College Park, MD. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 207 222).
- Dublon, F. J. (1983, Fall). Women doctoral students in higher administration: Life-style aspirations and multiple role commitments. Journal of NAWDAC, 47(1), 20-24.

- Erikson, K. A., & Pitner, N. J. (1980, December). The mentor concept is alive and well. NASSP Bulletin, 64(440), 8-13.
- Farmer, N. J. (1982, February). Characteristics of women principals in North Carolina (The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1982). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43(8), 2513A.
- Fins, A. (1974, September). Sex and the principal: A long look at Title IX. NASSP Bulletin, 54(383), 53-62.
- Fishel, A., & Pottker, J. (1973, March). Women lose out: Is there sex discrimination in school administration? Clearing House, 47(7), 387-91.
- Fisher, L. J. (1981). The role of women in education: Antecedents, current status, and change strategies (The University of North Dakota). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42(4), 1397A.
- Fiske, E., & Sandbank J. (1982, April). Androgyny and the new educator. High School Journal, 65(7), 226-31.
- Gall, J. P. (1981, February). Sex equity in organizational development numbers and processes. Presented at the Annual Conference for Facilitators of Organization Development in Education (3rd, Eugene OR, February, 1979). ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 231 069).

- Gordon, R. S., & Ball, P. G. (1979). Survival dynamics for women in educational administration. Journal of NAWDAC. (Reprint). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 191 342).
- Grasser, C., & Rose, C. (1982, March). Assessing the status of women students and employees in vocational education in California. Project PASSEVE. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, NY, NY, March 19-23, 1982. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 215 206).
- Green, M. (1982, Fall). A Washington perspective on women and networking: The power and the pitfalls. Journal of the NAWDAC, 46(1), 17-21.
- Holt, M. E. (1981, Spring). Strategies for the "Ascent of Women" in higher education administration in the 80's. Journal of the NAWDAC, 44(3), 21-24.
- Howard, S. (1975). Why aren't women administering our schools? The status of women public school teachers and factors hindering their promotion into administration. "Wanted: More Women" Series, National Council of Administrative Women Education, Washington, DC, 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 126 592).

- Hoyl, J. (1969, January). Who shall be principal--A man or a woman? National Elementary Principal, 48 (3), 23-24.
- Hughes, L. W., & Robertson, T. A. (1980, Spring). Principals and the management of conflict. Planning and Changing, 11(1), 3-16.
- Hyer, P. B. (Ph.D). (1984). Affirmative action for women: An assessment of progress at doctorate-granting universities and an analysis of successful approaches (Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1983). Dissertation Abstracts International, 42(12), 3608-3609A.
- Jackson, C. B. (1981). Career development for women in public school administration: A study of women school superintendents in the United States (University of Colorado, 1980, at Boulder). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41(8), 3353A.
- Johnson, F. D. H. (1977). The relationship between rule administration and the leadership behavior of Black male and female urban elementary school principals. Paper presented to the Annual National Conference on Urban Education, "The Survival of Urban Education," Norfolk, Virginia, November 20-22, 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 153 338).

- Jones, E., & Montenegro, X. (1982). Recent trends in the representation of women and minorities in school administration and problems in documentation. American Association of School Administrators, Arlington, Virginia, July, 1982. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 226 468).
- Kalvelage, J. (1978, October). The decline in female elementary principals since 1928: Riddles and clues. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 163 594).
- Kesl, G. (1975, September). Principals and community power structure. College Student Journal, 9(3), 287-89.
- Kimmel, E. (1983, June). An institute for preparing women for careers in vocational administration. Final report from 11/1/82 to 6/30/83. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 233 164).
- Mertz, S., Grossnickle, D., & Tutcher, C. (1980, December). Women in administration? You've got to be kidding! (Revisited). NASSP Bulletin, 64(440), 35-39.
- Moore, K. M., & Sagaria, M. A. O. (1981, Winter). Women administrators and mobility: The second struggle. Journal of the NAWDAC, 44(2), 21-28.
- Morsink, H. (1970, September). Leader behavior of men and women principals. NAASP Bulletin, 54(347), 80-87.

- Mulder, A. E. (Ph.D) (1984). Women in educational administration: Paths and profits. (The University of Michigan, 1983). Dissertation Abstracts International, 44(10), 2943A.
- Neidig, M. (1980). The other half of the talent bank: Women administrators. NASSP Annual Meeting. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 181 600).
- Olson, N. (1982, January). Women in education. Educational Leadership, 39(4), 318.
- Owens, E. T. (1975). Perceived barriers to employment for women as educational administrators in South Carolina public schools (University of South Carolina). Dissertation Abstracts International, 36(11), 7107A.
- Pacheo, B. A. (1982). Barriers to advancement in educational administration as perceived by women administrators (University of the Pacific). Dissertation Abstracts International, 43(5), 1377A.
- Paddock, S. (1978, January). Careers in educational administration: Are women the exception? University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon. Center for Educational Policy. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 149 468).

- Paddock, S. C. (1978). Male and female high school principals--a comparative study. Paper presented at Annual Meeting AERA, San Francisco, California, April 8-12, 1978. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 170 862).
- Paddock, S. C. (1980, December). Women principals: The rule or the exception. NASSP Bulletin, 64(440), 1. (Reprint UMI).
- Pallante, J. J., & Hilton, C. L. (1977, Summer). Authority positions for women: Principalships in public education. Contemporary Education, 48(4) 206-10.
- Pawlitschek, E. A. (1976). Female administrator acceptance. Masters Thesis, University of Minnesota. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 155 776).
- Pearson, B. E., & others. (1981, December). Factors affecting employers preference for female managerial applicants. Journal of Employment Counseling, 18(4), 176-82.
- Peters, J. (1980, December). The quest of the new woman in public school education. NASSP Bulletin, 64(440), 14-18.
- Recent trends in the representation of women and minorities in school administration and problems in documentation. (July, 1982). American Association of School Administrators. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 226 468).

- Romero, L. K. (1983, July). Women administrators in Pennsylvania's public schools--overcoming barriers to recruitment and promotions (Temple University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 44(1), 36A-37A.
- Schmuck, P. A., and others. (1983). The Oregon story: Sex equity in educational leadership, Oregon University, (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 236 806).
- Schubert, J. G. (1983, April). Breathing life into a national strategy for education equity. American Institute for Research in the Behavioral Sciences. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 233 949).
- Scrizzi, M. (ED.D) (1984). Characteristics of selected women in key administrative positions in vocational education who overcome factors contributing to their underrepresentation within the commonwealth of Massachusetts. (University of Massachusetts, 1983). Dissertation Abstracts International, 44(10), 29 47A.
- Seawell, W. H., & Canady, R. L. (1974, May-June). Where have all the women gone? National Elementary Principal, 53(4), 46-48.
- Sex Equity in Educational Leadership. (1977, April). Report of a Conference (Eugene, Oregon, April 15-17, 1977). Center for Educational Policy and Management. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 149 470).

- Shapiro, C. (1984, May). We'll sue your school board to win equity for women administrators. American School Board Journal. 171(5), 43, 44, 45, 47.
- Simeone, A. M. (Ph.D) (1984). Academic women: The process of two decades. (University of Pennsylvania, 1983). Dissertation Abstracts International, 44(12), 3613A.
- Smith, A., & Boykin, A. (1982, March). Title IX in Illinois--a matter of principal. American Educational Research Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 218 763).
- Smith, J. A. (1978, May). Encouraging women to enter administration. NASSP Bulletin, 62(418), 114-19.
- Smith, M. A., and others (1983). Women getting together and getting ahead: Sex equity in educational leadership. Oregon University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 236 805).
- Smith, R. A. (1976, April). Women administrators--"Is the price too high?" NASSP Bulletin, 60(399), 99-103.
- Stephanz, V. L. (1981). Major obstacles to women's progress in educational administration: A comprehensive overview of major influences, developing trends, conclusions to be drawn, and recommendations (George Peabody College for Teachers of Vanderbilt University, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41(9), 3826A.

- Swoboda, M., & Vanderbosch, J. (1983, Spring). The society of outsiders: Women in administration. Journal of NAWDAC, 46(3), 3-6.
- Tibbetts, S. L. (1980). The woman principal: Superior to the male? Journal of the NAWDAC, 43(4), 15. (Reprint UMI).
- Van Meir, E. J. (1975, Summer). Sexual discrimination in school administration. Journal of NAWDAC, 8(4), 163-167.
- Villadsen, A. W. (1981). A study of the interactions between family responsibilities and careers in selected Southern institutions of higher education (University of Alabama, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41(8), 3374A-3375A.
- Villani, S. (1983). Mentoring and sponsoring as ways for women to overcome internal barriers to heighten career aspirations and achievement (Northeastern University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 44(6), 1658A-1659A.
- Watkins, J. F. (1969, September). An inquiry into the principal-staff relationship. Journal of Educational Research, 63(1), 11.
- Winslow, M. B. (1977). Increased effectiveness among women educational administrators: Two local efforts to combat administrator isolation. Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, NY, NY, April 4-8, 1977. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 139 106).

Youngs, B. B. (1983, March). Redefining leadership for a new age. The School Administrator, 40(3), 17-19.

Zakrajsek, B. (1976, April). An alternative to women's lib--obtaining a principalship. NASSP Bulletin, 60(399), 94.