

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Journal of Women in Educational Leadership

Educational Administration, Department of

1-2006

Journal of Women in Educational Leadership, Vol. 4, No. 1-January 2006

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/jwel>



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#), and the [Women's Studies Commons](#)

"Journal of Women in Educational Leadership, Vol. 4, No. 1-January 2006" (2006). *Journal of Women in Educational Leadership*. 170.
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/jwel/170>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Educational Administration, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Women in Educational Leadership by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Letters Please!

Marilyn L. Grady
Barbara Y. LaCost

We welcome the fourth volume of the *Journal of Women in Educational Leadership*. During the inaugural years of the journal, we have witnessed the increasing number of manuscript submissions and have appreciated the level of scholarship reflected in the submitted manuscripts. We have added new features to the journal such as Voices of Women in the Field, Women in History, and First Things First. In our national travels, we are continually approached by individuals who want to discuss the journal. We are pleased with the number of individuals who have read the journal, are subscribing to it, or are considering submitting their manuscripts for review. News of the journal is spreading!

If you would like to comment on any of the manuscripts that appear in the journal, we would welcome your letters in a new Letters to the Editor column we will feature in subsequent issues. We welcome your comments and appreciate your support of the *Journal of Women in Educational Leadership*!

Proposals for presentations at the *20th Annual Women in Educational Leadership Conference* are being accepted! The conference will be October 8-9, 2006, in Lincoln, Nebraska. For information about the conference or proposal guidelines contact Marilyn Grady at mgradyl@unl.edu

Women in History

Grace Abbott: A Leader in Social Reform

Shari Cole Hoffman

One of the earlier 20th century American women leaders in Progressivism was Grace Abbott who led the way so others might be the voices for those unheard. Abbott's heritage influenced her lifetime commitment to social improvement. She was born on November 17, 1878 in Grand Island, Nebraska into a family of activists. Her Quaker mother, Elizabeth Griffin Abbott, came from an abolitionist family and participated in the Underground Railroad. Elizabeth was also actively involved in the women's suffrage movement and often hosted suffrage meetings and events in her home. Susan B. Anthony frequently stayed with the Abbotts when visiting Grand Island. Her father, Othman Ali Abbott, a Canadian abolitionist, served in the Union Army during the Civil War. He read law in Illinois and in 1867 moved to Nebraska and established his law practice. A leader in state politics, he became a state senator and eventually the lieutenant governor, where he was pivotal in the creation of Nebraska laws protecting female workers.

The Abbott's values and interests in social justice had a prevailing influence on all four of their children, but especially on Grace and her older sister, Edith, who also became a well-known social reformer. Their parent's ardent convictions in equal rights for women seemed to set a personal and professional course that Grace Abbott followed until her death in 1939.

After graduating from the Grand Island Baptist College in 1898, Grace taught high school in Broken Bow, Nebraska and then in her hometown until 1906. During summer vacations, she enrolled in graduate studies at the University of Nebraska in 1902 and at the University of Chicago in 1904. In 1907, she moved to Chicago and enrolled full-time at the University, where she studied political science and constitutional history. She earned a Master of Philosophy in Political Science in 1909.

While in Chicago, Grace took up a nine-year residency at Hull-House, a settlement home for disadvantaged families. Co-founded by Jane Addams, another early social reformer who later earned the 1931 Nobel Peace prize

About the Author

Shari Cole Hoffman is a graduate assistant and doctoral student at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Her specialization is Educational Leadership. She has held faculty and administrative leadership roles in the K-12 system for 20 years. At the community-college level, she has extensive experience in institutional planning, quality improvement, and accreditation.

for her work in social justice for the underprivileged, Hull-House initially provided welfare assistance and housing to the poor, then expanded its services to include rooms for working women, a community kitchen, academic classes, and a meeting place for trade unions. Hull-House became a center for progressive reform in Chicago and a training ground for leaders in labor rights and women's suffrage. Closely associated with Jane Addams and Hull-House endeavors, Abbott developed an interest in social work and a passionate commitment to those in need. Also during this time, she gained national recognition as an advocate for immigrants.

While on the faculty of the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy, which later became the University of Chicago's Graduate School of Social Service Administration, Abbott, along with Sophonisba Breckinridge and others, organized the Immigrants' Protective League (IPL). IPL helped protect immigrants from mistreatment and assisted them in adjusting to the United States. As the director of IPL, a position Abbott held until 1917, she created a way station for immigrants near Chicago's main railroad terminal, where a number of immigrants arrived looking for work. She was also responsible for securing protective legislation in Illinois to regulate the exploitation of immigrant employment and to prevent immigrant savings loss by privately formed banking companies. Abbott developed Illinois' state plan for the enforcement of compulsory school attendance of immigrant children. She successfully secured the Chicago Bar Association's support for protecting immigrants in the court system. Testifying before a 1912 congressional hearing, she spoke against a mandatory immigrant literacy test and later persuaded President Taft to veto an act of Congress to implement this test. Despite her initial success in 1912, Congress eventually instituted the literacy requirement in 1917.

Throughout Abbott's life, she was an activist for child welfare. In 1917 because of her recognized dedication to improving the lives of immigrants, she was appointed director of the Industrial Division of the Children's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor. In that position, she developed

enforcement plans for the first child labor laws Congress had enacted in 1916.

In 1921, President Warren G. Harding selected Abbott to succeed Julia Lathrop as head of the U.S. Children's Bureau, which was established in 1912 as the first national agency in the world to focus on the needs of children. Through Abbott's leadership, the Bureau administered America's original child labor laws, established standards for state juvenile courts, and designed the children's section in the 1935 Social Security Act pertaining to Aid to Families with Dependent Children, Title V (federal grants to states for maternal and child welfare), and Title VII (the establishment of the Social Security administration office). Abbott also pioneered the process of incorporating sociological data and statistics into lawmaking processes. Under her direction, the agency was the earliest to utilize scientific investigations on children, which highlighted the issues for the neglected and the poor, in designing policy.

In 1934, after resigning from the Children's Bureau, Abbott was appointed a professor of public welfare at the University of Chicago's School of Social Service Administration where her sister, Edith, was the first graduate school woman dean in the United States. Abbott held this professorship, edited the *Social Service Review*, continued to chair international labor conferences and state committees addressing child labor, and stayed actively involved in the peace movement and women's rights until her death in 1939, at 61 years old.

The lifetime achievements of Grace Abbott entailed numerous firsts. She administered the first federal child labor laws that kept many children under 16 out of oppressive working conditions. These child labor laws were often referred to as "the acid test of progressivism." She oversaw the Sheppard-Towner Maternity and Infancy Act of 1921, the first federally funded social welfare measure in the United States. The Act distributed federal matching grants to the states for prenatal and child health clinics, nutrition and hygiene information, midwife training, and nursing visits for pregnant women and new mothers. In 1922, Abbott was the first American appointed to a League of Nations committee.

At one time, Grace Abbott was the highest-ranking most powerful woman in the United States government, yet she stayed the course in what she believed. Through her leadership example of forging a path for other women to follow, individuals learned to work together to make a collective difference in the lives of those in need. As a leader and throughout her lifetime, Abbott embodied what was best about Progressivism. She not only

provided a voice for those too poor or too young to protect themselves, but she took actions to help those who could not help themselves.

References

- Encyclopedia Britannica. *Women in American History*. Retrieved December 1, 2005, from http://search.eb.com/women/articles/Abbott_Grace.htm
- Kirkland, W. (1989). *The Many Faces of the Hull House*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Illinois Press.
- Magill, F. N. (1995). *Great Lives from History, American Women Series*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Salem Press.
- Sanders, J. (1998). *Notable Nebraskans*. Lincoln, Nebraska: Media Productions and Marketing, Inc.
- Lengermann, P.M. and Niebrugge-Brantley, J. (1998). *The Women Founders: Sociology and Social Theory 1830-1930*. Columbus, Ohio: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Library of Congress, American Memory (2005). *Jane Addams and Hull-House*. Retrieved November 25, 2005, from <http://memory.loc.gov/ammem/today/sep06.html>
- Nebraska Department of Education (2005). *Grace Abbott (1878-1939)*. Retrieved November 28, 2005, from <http://www.nde.state.ne.us/SS/notables/abbottg.html>
- University of Chicago (2005). *Grace Abbott*. Retrieved November 28, 2005, from <http://www.ssa.uchicago.edu/aboutssa/history/tour1e.shtml>

Women Engineering Faculty: Expanding The Pipeline

Nadene Deiterman Greni

The purpose for this case study was to explore the features of undergraduate engineering departmental and college support that influenced the persistence of women students. Women engineering faculty members were among the participants at three Land Grant universities in the Midwest. The data revealed the theme, Expanding the Pipeline, and demonstrated how women engineering faculty perceived their role in helping to encourage women students to persist in engineering majors.

In 1997 women made up nearly half of the U.S. labor force, but only slightly more than one-fifth of the science and engineering labor force. Of those scientists and engineers, women were most present as social scientists (more than half) and as physical scientists (22%). Women engineers constituted 9% of the engineering workforce in 1997 (National Science Board, 1998). Approximately 2% of bachelor's degree-level graduates of engineering disciplines in the U.S. in 1975 were women. The number of women completing undergraduate engineering degrees rose to more than 10% by 1981, but by 1998 still less than 20% of undergraduate engineering degrees were obtained by women (National Science Board, 2002).

A 35 year study of trends of incoming freshman to higher education by Astin, Oseguera, Sax, and Korn (2002) found that career interests of men and women in traditionally male fields such as medicine, law, business, and engineering had converged. A modest increase in women's interest and a decline in men's interest were attributed to the case of engineering. A gender gap of 10.7% in student aspirations for engineering was the largest of any of the sex-stereotypical careers, with smaller gaps in elementary education, allied health, business, and nursing.

The rationale for a qualitative study was to explore the types of undergraduate engineering departmental support that influenced the persistence of women students. The perceptions of women undergraduate engineering students, women engineering faculty, and engineering department chairs were examined. Six female engineering faculty members

About the Author

Nadene Deiterman Greni received a bachelor's degree in industrial arts/technology from Black Hills State in 1987. She worked for and with a number of engineers, architects and technicians at a consulting engineering firm, a university physical plant, and a telephone utility.

Greni completed the civil engineering prerequisite courses in 1995 at South Dakota State University. She taught several sections of engineering graphics and construction management classes while working on the master's degree in industrial management at South Dakota State University in 1996 and 1997 and earned a M.S. degree in 1997. Greni taught from 1998 to 2002 in an associate's degree program in computer-aided drafting at Western Dakota Technical Institute. She served as a mentor to a group of women students from all of the gender non-traditional areas of Western Dakota Technical Institute. She interned with the multicultural affairs office at South Dakota School of Mines and Technology and studied the lack of retention of women undergraduate engineering students from 2002 to 2003. Greni taught construction management for two years at the University of Nebraska at Kearney while she completed her Ph.D. in Education-Administration, Curriculum and Instruction. Currently she is Girl Program/Special Projects Coordinator with Girls Scouts of the Black Hills Council. ngreni@girlscouts-blackhills.org

holding doctoral degrees in an engineering discipline were among the participants at three universities located in the Midwest established as Land Grant universities under the Morrill Act of 1862 (University A, 2003a; University B, n.d.; University C, n.d.). Each was classified as a Doctoral/Research University—Extensive by the Carnegie Foundation. University A enrolled nearly 3,000 undergraduate engineering students with an average of 13% female enrollment. Female participation in engineering disciplines ranged from nearly 34% in industrial engineering to 7% in mechanical engineering. Approximately 2,500 students were undergraduate engineering students at University B, which had an average female participation of 15%. Women student participation ranged from 43% of biological systems students to below 3% of agricultural engineering students. Engineering at University C consisted of 5,000 students, 16% women. Female engineering student participation ranged from nearly 39% in chemical engineering to below 7% in electrical engineering.

Interviews were conducted at the main campus of each university during the spring semester of 2004. The faculty members represented a variety of

engineering disciplines including agricultural engineering, chemical engineering, industrial engineering, materials engineering, and mechanical engineering. Two of the faculty had recently begun serving in administrative positions and another had worked for a time as an administrator.

The following descriptions include the use of pseudonyms for each participant. Dr. Andrea Allen seemed aware of her role model image and familiar with literature regarding increasing the numbers of women engineering students. She was fairly new to her department and appeared very open and energetic. Dr. Amy Arnold also gave the impression that she was cognizant of her role as a mentor to women students. Dr. Beth Brown explained her thoughts and experiences as a woman engineering faculty member very openly and related several accounts of her engineer father. Dr. Brenda Bailey stated that she did not have much to offer for some questions, but relayed information about role modeling the active learning approaches used in her classes. Dr. Cara Carlson described her enjoyment with the growth of the numbers of women students in her classes and had recently been appointed chair of her engineering department. Dr. Catherine Carter stated her concern that the drive for more women in engineering resulted in oppression rather than encouragement.

Four themes emerged from the study, and faculty responses contributed to the development of those themes. The loss of women in engineering has been referred to in the current literature as a leak in the engineering pipeline, so the pipeline theme carried on this practice. The In the Pipeline theme emerged from information that was noted about the individual student that helped to create an encouraging or neutral environment. The Navigating the Pipeline theme developed from two sub-themes dealing with the individual student that was detrimental to an individual's progress in an engineering major. The Pipeline Tools theme discussed how students find classroom work, how faculty present learning material, and how classroom learning relates to the engineering workplace. The Expanding the Pipeline theme explained how engineering college personnel see their role in helping to encourage women students in engineering majors.

The Expanding the Pipeline theme emerged from sub-themes described as Beyond Classroom Learning, Building Community, Faculty Experience, No Special Treatment, Number of Women, and Role Modeling. Beyond Classroom Learning included plant trips, research, and methods employed to help students see where their professional engineering degree could lead. The Building Community sub-theme described the methods employed to make women students feel welcome in the major. Women faculty members related some of the events they recalled in their own backgrounds in Faculty Experience. No Special Treatment and Number of Women depicted the

observations made by participants with regard to women undergraduate engineering students. In the sub-theme of Role Modeling faculty participants described their perceptions of being role models for men and women students.

Faculty research, organizations of women in engineering, and discipline-specific professional organizations all helped students see their lives as engineers in Beyond Classroom Learning. Dr. Allen said, "It's been fun to try to find young women to work with, just to give them that opportunity to see what research is. How they can move that forward." She added, "It kinda gets back to that, not everyone likes to take things apart so if you have women in your class who don't like to take things apart." And she continued, "[You can s]how . . . how you are applying the engineering that you like to do." Dr. Arnold said,

[T]here are a number of industrial sponsors that provide financial resources and some guidance to try to help us to picture the successful women and underrepresented minorities. And I think some of those programs are fairly well designed. The challenge at this institution as I have seen it is getting those programs to migrate into the student body as a whole. The number of students that participate in those programs is relatively small. That means their impact is not so great. . . . Some of the women would consider these programs unnecessary and they don't want to be associated with them because they think they suggest that they need special help and so there's a bit of a problem to get the students to take advantage of them, some of them just don't want to. . . . [T]hey help the students that are involved with them. Students who choose to avail themselves of those programs, they get training, get to interact with people, get exposure to industrial sponsors that the rest of the students don't get. And that certainly is going to be helpful.

She continued,

[We] actually had a change in our curriculum, made it more effective for students to take the undergraduate research course and added [it] as a required component of the curriculum and so we've actually had a big increase in the number of students that are participating in undergraduate research. Some of those are women and I think those types of things can help them persevere as undergraduates because if they see that this means something. It might impact somebody in the world at some point [so] then they get much more excited and much more likely to do it. I've seen studies and I believe that women are much more concerned with societal impact of what they are doing than the men. And that certainly seems to be the case for the ones that I know. And so showing them that there is impact to what they are doing I think is really important. So we are actually pushing the undergraduate research option. I think it is going to be important for them

and I think it will open some of their eyes to the concepts that they can go to graduate school. They don't have to stop and get a job.

Dr. Brown said,

I think the bigger issue probably we have more female students involved in coops [cooperative learning] and so on. I think in general we're very sensitive to students that are in coops, making sure that they have the courses they need when they come back, that would disproportionately affect them, the female students. They are in high demand in the coops. Proportionately more of our female students are active in coops, working in the field during the summers.

Dr. Carson said,

I think it is working with these [student] organizations because that is where they find other students taking the same classes and also get exposure to industry. I think we have research experiences for undergraduates, which is where faculty have undergraduates working in their labs. That's great experience, the program for women in science and engineering has a summer program where they support students in faculty labs and all of those, I believe, are ways that students can get connected. That's really what it's all about.

Dr. Carter described a woman student she encouraged in an internship, "[S]he was talented and I knew she was, but I got a call from [an engineering firm] to say they wanted a [student intern]." She continued

[They said] pick one because they like to have them back several semesters and . . . [the student said] "I can't, I can't, I don't know anything," [I said] "[T]rust me this time." She finally gave in and did go and have a wonderful experience. They hired her back and she ended up . . . [a] very capable engineer. . . . [I]t's always fun, too, when I can help a woman recognize her own talents.

Classroom activities also helped students see their lives as practicing engineers. Dr. Allen said,

So getting the women to understand that there are a lot more applications and many applications, even if they aren't thinking engineering, if they are thinking science, that engineering still has a home for them. The biomedical type areas, where a lot of women tend to go. Engineering can still provide a good foundation for them and give them a career in engineering as opposed to just going into science, I think that is something that is probably not focused enough on young women.

Dr. Arnold remarked,

[T]he freshman engineering class is partly driven by what we thought was the need to show societal impact of the work we were doing very early so they can say I am not taking an engineering class this year but next year I am going to get to and then I am going to have an opportunity to do this really cool stuff. I think it works.

Dr. Allen relayed, “[T]he departments are trying to get the kids in and show them applications in the freshmen year, even though they don’t have the math skills or chemistry skills to pull off a design.” She added, “[A]t least they can see what kind of design they would potentially be looking at. Hopefully that will help.”

Academic engineering departments worked to build community and faculty discussed methods of Building Community used by themselves and their departments. They cited friendliness, a comfortable atmosphere, and attempts to get students working together as ways to build community. Dr. Allen described a national competition that took place,

. . . in the summer at our national meeting so it varies where they’ll go. There have been women on that team. I don’t think, [we] never had huge numbers except in the . . . competition where we have more women. I don’t think that the women feel they can’t play any of these games that our department does. . . . I would say that they would feel pretty welcome in this department.

Dr. Arnold discussed student organization activities designed to get students involved in the department.

I think they are all good, I think anything that gets them involved is good, I think it is actually quite good that the students are the initiators of the activities, because they have a much better understanding of what’s gonna be interesting than we do. Because they are willing to put the energy together to try to get it to happen, it means that at least there is going to be a group that shows up for sure which will act as the nucleus around which the rest of them will gravitate. So I am actually quite happy with the level of activities that the undergraduate student body is involved in right now. In some sense you have to balance, if you have too much social activity, then it starts to put a drain on all the other things that they are doing. So, the level they are at now is sufficient to provide a sense of community, a sense of individuals that care about me as a person and want to see me succeed and a sense of excitement that some things are happening here. I am hopeful that we will be able to maintain it.

Dr. Bailey said,

We have what we call FAC. Fridays After Class. In . . . E and that is sponsored by . . . [student professional organization]. So again that is an opportunity for them to get involved with things outside of class. They do plan trips to places, we have a picnic at the end of the year. We have a welcome back to school picnic. I think those are some of the social activities that I see them participating in. . . . I don't know that we have done anything in a while, I mean I don't think we have done anything real proactive in helping women students persist. I think, well, Dr. D. participates in, and I go from time to time to the women['s] . . . engineering day. . . . [H]e is committed to that. And he shows up at the event where a lot of departments don't show up. Also sends the message that . . . E is the place that [is] women-friendly.

Women faculty reported a broad range of experiences in engineering. Faculty related experiences that they had experienced as women engineering students and women engineering faculty that guided their understanding of women undergraduate engineering students. Examples of Faculty Experience were described by each faculty member. Dr. Allen described women friends she had as an undergraduate student,

[T]ypically in engineering it doesn't really matter what that woman is like, you tend to make friends because there aren't any other women. You just kind of hung together. There was no way I would have been friends with most of the women I graduated with if we'd have had much of a choice. But we were all friends because there were just three of us.

In another instance Dr. Allen said,

Originally I thought I would do more [specific engineering area]. . . . I remember wanting very badly to work on a . . . [specific area] for a summer. My mom's best friend's husband owned a . . . firm in town. I thought, man, I got it made. And he wouldn't hire me because I was a woman. "Women cry too easy, I can't put up with that crap on my jobsite." He had one woman that worked in his whole [business], and he had a very large . . . company. She answered the phones. [He d]idn't want me on a job. We [women] weren't reliable and we cry too easy.

Dr. Brown reported, "[W]hen I was a beginning professor, I really struggled with the first two children." And added, "I took a lot of flack from colleagues at technical meetings, people here were saying your kids shouldn't travel, they should be at home and so should you." Dr. Arnold

described an incident that happened while she was faculty at another university.

A student had come in [to a faculty colleague] to ask a technical problem and he correctly identified me as the faculty member who would be most likely to help in this situation. So my faculty colleague said, “[Y]ou could go talk to Mrs. C. about that because she understands that area, she is pretty good. She can help you.” And the student walked two doors down and knocked on my door and said “Mrs. C. can I ask you a question?” And I didn’t look up, and he knocked again and I looked up and he said, “Mrs. C. can I ask you a question?” And I looked at him and I said, “Mrs. C., that’s my Mom, she’s not here. There is no Mrs. C. here,” I felt bad for him, and he stopped for a second and very quickly proceeded, “Dr. C., can I ask you a question?” “Sure. What can I help you with?” And so the student never did it again and I talked to my faculty colleague and said, “You know, it’s not really my name and Dr. C. is better.” “Oh sure,” he said. He didn’t really mean anything by it, but it was a little insult in essence, because he was undermining my professional working with the students. Stuff like that happens. I don’t think they overtly mean to be problematic, but they are.

Dr. Brown relayed another instance of her experience as a female engineering faculty member,

I don’t understand the dynamic of what happens in my class when I’m the only woman, there’s sometimes . . . a very different environment when I have an all male class. I don’t think that the men in there intentionally do it or they’re even aware of it, but I think sometimes we get set up when I’m the only woman there, I’ll get a student who’s going to work at challenging me, where I think they are almost embarrassed to do that if there is a female colleague in the room. Or they don’t do it, I don’t think, I don’t know what the dynamic is or why it doesn’t happen, but it doesn’t happen. The only time I have ever had a student that would just, would try and nail you to the wall is in an all male class. I don’t know why that is, but I can usually say, “[I]t’s a very interesting question, you can come to my office and you talk about it and I can try and get you the right reading material. You can go learn about it and I’ll show you how to do that,” but I’ve had students in all male classes, sometimes . . . [ask a very specific question and] I’ll say you know, this is a general . . . course and . . . I’d have to go look it up, I can show you how to do that, and they just won’t let go. I’ve had students dig and dig and dig and feel that they had some need to sort of embarrass me, but I don’t think that when there is another woman present that they do that. That’s probably the strangest phenomena that has happened. Probably three of four different times, so a pretty good correlation with that.

Dr. Carter said,

I do know that there have been a couple of times when I mentioned to faculty that, "[T]hat's probably not a comfortable thing for you to say in front of women," and they'll look at me kind of puzzled and go, "Oh, I guess you are right." Within my limited reach try to help the other people be a little more sensitive to some issues.

Faculty noted no instances of special treatment for women students. Dr. Brown related, "I don't think there's any thought there [to addressing women specifically] and maybe that's good, maybe it means they just assume they're teaching students and they aren't worried about what they're doing."

Dr. Allen said, "I definitely don't do anything to purposefully hurt women in the classroom, but I haven't spent a lot of time thinking specifically about examples that I do and whether or not they are gender friendly." She added,

[S]o is there something I've done in particular, no. Is there something I know the University is spending a lot of time thinking about, yes, I think the nation, the ABET community is spending a lot of time thinking about that.

Dr. Arnold said,

I think actually if you look at the undergraduate student body and ask are there any, would I expect that a female student would feel any level of discrimination or special treatment from any of her colleagues, I think the answer is no. There probably are expectations. . . . [S]o I don't think the students see any special treatment.

Dr. Brown related an instance where she described requiring female students to do lab work,

I can think of a few times where sometimes the most important thing I need to say to a female student is, "[Y]ou are not out of it because you are female, I know you can do it, get back in there. Pick up the tools and particularly in the lab, pick up the tools, and just do it, you can wire that circuit, you'll be fine, try and do it." Being female and looking at a female across the table and saying, "[N]ope, if I can do it . . . you can do it." That puts to rest some of the, oh, I have to find somebody to carry it for me or wire it for me, or do it for me and I think that is where we help them develop. If you felt somehow limited before, there are no excuses in my group.

Dr. Arnold summed up her idea of No Special Treatment by relaying,

I think the faculty really tries to support the undergraduate student and provide a curriculum and an environment that allows the students to be successful, but I don't think there is any particular emphasis on what makes the women different and what we need to do to resolve their issues, or assist them in their transition . . . from student to professional.

Participants reflected on the Numbers of Women in their engineering programs. Faculty reported current numbers of women students varied with discipline, and that a 50/50 gender mix was a goal for the department. Dr. Allen said,

We are low [in numbers of women students] right now. Why that is, I don't know . . . I think our numbers are down overall . . . Our department probably doesn't face some of the issues a lot of the other departments on campus do because we do have a fairly high amount of women.

Dr. Carter described her department by saying, "We don't have very many women." Dr. Arnold relayed information about numbers of women in her department and described the numbers of women in the college of engineering at University A,

[O]ur [engineering major] student body is almost 40% women and that means that there is nothing particularly special about the fact that they're there. . . . I've looked at that number and can find the absolute number of women in the college is not dropping. The absolute number of women is actually going up just a little bit. But the average number of men is going up faster so our percentages are dropping. But I think it's just a residence time issue.

Faculty discussed the desire for more women students. Dr. Allen remarked,

The department is definitely interested in increasing the numbers of women and have been involved in numerous grants and discussions to try to figure out how to do all this gender equity work, how to recruit young women, how to focus in on what, listen to what young women are saying that they want to do and figure out how that pulls things together.

Dr. Bailey said, "I know our department wants to have more [women]." And Dr. Arnold said, "[T]here really has been a significant effort to increase the number of women in the college." Dr. Brown

spoke in terms of the college of engineering at University B rather than her department and said,

My opinion is we'll get the right number, I don't know if we'll ever get to 50%, but when my grade distribution for my female students looks like my grade distribution for my male students maybe we'll be teaching at least all of the women who want to be here. I'm not sure I would aim for 50%, but all of the women are grouped at the very top, or the very bottom. The whole mid-range is missing. . . . [W]e had a new student coordinator working at the college who said, okay, we're going to double the number of students, female students in engineering and science. . . . I would love to see that happened, but you have to realize that there has never been more than 17% female students the whole time I've been here. And so coming in and putting numbers out and saying we're going to double the number of female students without a pretty proactive plan just doesn't make sense. . . . We seem to have a retention problem, we know that we have about 17% women in the incoming class. And by the time they graduate it's about 10% of the college of engineering.

Two faculty members described numbers of women students at both ends of the spectrum. Dr. Bailey described having more women than men in her classes,

I tend to have more women in my classes, well, at times I've had more women in my classes than I've had guys and I think that has something to do with just the nature of . . . engineering. In that it is more, tends to be one of the fields that women are more likely to go in to than men.

Dr. Carlson described her delight when, "I taught a senior elective in . . . [a specific area] and I had five women in a class which was unbelievable, I had never had five women before." She added, "Three has been the max and by that time I knew all of them pretty well and it was just a really neat experience."

Faculty reported an awareness of their image as a female engineering role model that was important for male students as well as female students. Faculty discussed an awareness of their responsibility as role models. Dr. Allen said,

I've had the opportunity to work very closely with two young women honor students and I've really enjoyed that, one woman is now getting her Ph.D. . . . Hopefully I've had some influence on her wanting to stay in the research area. The other young woman is just a junior and she worked for me her sophomore year and will work for me till she graduates. And I . . .

will be very disappointed if D. doesn't go for her Ph.D. . . . Being a good role model, I think that—or I think [that means] also bringing your research into the classroom to show the students what you do.

Dr. Arnold explained,

I think being there helps them. Especially in an institution like this that is relatively small, if they only see men teaching then I think they start to think that this is something that men do even though the men are to their credit come out and say a lot of women are doing this, look around you. There are a lot of women in this class. A visual role model, I think helps them. . . . So being there is good. Understanding, having some appreciation of what they might be thinking is good. It's really trivial but I actually had my course video taped and evaluated by a neutral person in a class a long time ago and the person that was doing the evaluation said, you know, you always refer to the hypothetical person on the job as he, I probably do. So now I really, really try. Every time I force myself to think about it, I refer to the person as SHE. . . . What I find in terms of the role model thing, having women faculty teaching predominantly male courses, I have found has probably had a bigger impact on the male students than it has had on the women.

Dr. Brown related, "I didn't realize that I have, just sometimes just being female and lecturing in a different style, that is, softer voice, more comfortable." She continued,

I had a teaching evaluation for the first time and I've been teaching more than a decade, that said, it was really nice to realize that you can be feminine and still be effective and I thought that was a really great compliment to me. I really felt good about that, I've had evaluations in the past that said I didn't like your purple dress, okay, obviously they noticed what I was wearing, that was less positive. But I felt that that was a really nice compliment. It obviously was a person who was making a decision for herself, I think, about. "[D]o I have to look like a guy to be able to do this traditionally male field?"

Dr. Bailey remarked about being a role model,

[I] just think it is a lot of intangible things that are happening that might do that. I think also, I am really available to my students. I think, different dimensions of students take advantage of that, but I have probably had for the most part, better connections with some of my women students just because it is a woman professor so they have a chance to talk about things that they wouldn't normally get a chance to talk about with a male faculty.

Dr. Carlson explained,

[I] think as a whole being technically sound and being able to stand up in front of a class and talk, to speak technically about our area, just to be professional, a professional woman in front of a class is the biggest thing you can do to show them that we have those capabilities to do that.

Dr. Carter said, “[It is] probably helpful to women which see me in my position.” And added, “[V]ery few of them will become faculty, although I’ve had a few women say what is it you want, [and] they say I want to be you. I’ll still be me.”

Women faculty in engineering departments communicated their unique experiences as undergraduate engineering students, practicing engineering, and engineering faculty. Study of their leadership is important to understanding the culture and climate experienced by undergraduate students in engineering programs. Women engineering faculty spoke of their persistence to continue study in their engineering discipline from the time they entered as undergraduate engineering students. They reported that they were often isolated in their departments and were vigilant in speaking out on behalf of fair practices for themselves and women students. Women engineering faculty stated their perceptions of themselves as role models and mentors for all students, and especially for women undergraduate engineering students.

Faculty members saw themselves as role models for both female and male students, especially in balancing work/life issues. They stated that women students found them more accessible on a personal basis than other faculty members. They recognized that their teaching methods and delivery were sometimes different from other faculty members in the department. Female faculty members recalled experiences they had faced in the engineering workplace and as faculty members where they themselves were recipients of gender bias. They attempted remedies in their departments by pointing out examples of bias to their male faculty colleagues when disrespectful remarks or actions were made towards themselves or students.

Women engineering faculty were often isolated across departments with little opportunity to connect with other female engineers. Women faculty took opportunities to work as supporters for women students by pointing out blatant and subtle sexist behavior or remarks made by faculty colleagues (Frehill, 1997). She continued, “[W]omen in engineering reported that students appeared to ‘test’ them more often than their male colleagues” (p. 130). Women engineering faculty described workplace issues and experiences as faculty that at times corresponded with the National Research

Council's (1994) description of "a culture of industry that is hostile." Frehill (1997) noted,

[M]any women still experience gender inequality in engineering workplaces and in higher education. Whether the gender inequality is blatant or subtle, intentional or unintentional, such discrimination reinforces our cultural stereotypes about women and men in the classroom and on the job. (p. 132)

Participants described a climate that showed No Special Treatment toward women students. Frehill's (1997) review of women in engineering shows that academic engineers were the most likely to be conscious of gender inequity and that women students were more likely to be the recipients of sexist attitudes from male peers than faculty. However, Frehill (1997) found that male faculty were not always aware that they were treating women students differently from men.

Participants reported a wide variety of the percentages of women students in the undergraduate classes, depending upon the engineering major. In data collected from 2900 undergraduate engineering programs by the American Society for Engineering Education (2003), the numbers of women receiving bachelor's degrees in engineering in 2002-2003 continued to hover around 20%. Biomedical engineering, chemical engineering, and environmental engineering had the highest female graduation of approximately 40%. Electrical engineering, computer engineering, and mechanical engineering had the lowest reported graduation rate for women at 14.8%, 13.2%, and 12.8% respectively. "Small numbers make women very visible; visibility draws attention to successful performance, but it also spotlights errors" (Rosser, 2004, p. 64). In 1997 Frehill wrote,

[F]emale engineers experience sexism in the classroom and the workplace because of two related characteristics. First, because there are so few women in engineering, they encounter problems associated with being a token. Second, engineering is a gendered profession. (p. 118)

Participants described the persistence of women students in terms of individual skills while the three universities—A, B, and C—were in various phases of implementing institutional changes to provide a more supportive atmosphere for women engineering students. The concept of replacing individual women's coping skills with institutional change was described by Rosser (2004).

[M]ore women than men are lost from science at every level of the pipeline. . . . Failure to change the percentage of women significantly by applying individual solutions suggests the need for systemic institutional

changes to facilitate the careers of individual women scientists and engineers. (p. 52)

The experiences of women engineering faculty and their influence on students should be considered for further study. Additional areas for exploration include: (a) how women engineering faculty relate their own experiences to teaching; (b) how women engineering faculty relate their own experiences to faculty advising; and (c) how students perceive women engineering faculty.

REFERENCES

- American Society for Engineering Education. (2003). *ASEE profiles of engineering and engineering technology colleges, 2003 edition*. Retrieved June 22, 2004, from <http://www.asee.org/>
- Astin, A. W., Oseguera, L., Sax, L. J., & Korn, W. S. (2002). *The American freshman: Thirty-five year trends*. Los Angeles, CA: UCLA Higher Education Research Institution.
- Frehill, L. M. (1997). Subtle sexism in engineering. In N. V. Benokraitis (Ed.), *Subtle sexism: Current practice and prospects for change* (pp. 117-135). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- National Research Council (Ed.). (1994). *Women scientists and engineers employed in industry: Why so few?* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- National Science Board. (1998). *Science & engineering indicators* (NSB 98-1). Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation.
- National Science Board. (2002). *Science and engineering indicators—2002* (NSB-02-1). Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation. Retrieved July 6, 2003, from <http://www.nsf.gov/sbe/srs/seind02/append/c2/at02-16.xls>
- Rosser, S. V. (2004). Using POWER to ADVANCE: Institutional barriers identified by women scientists and engineers. *NWSA Journal*, 16(1), 50-78.
- University A. (2003). *Historical information*. Retrieved June 2, 2004, from <http://www.universitya.edu/pa/statinfo/factbook/2003/003%20histinfo.pdf>
- University B. (n.d.). *University history*. Retrieved June 2, 2004, from <http://www.universityb.edu/universitybpub/special/history/index.shtml>
- University C. (n.d.). *It's a fact*. Retrieved June 2, 2004, from <http://www.universityc.edu/about/fact03/>

Teacher Ratings of Principal Applicants: The Significance of Gender and Leadership Style

Deborah Burdick
Arnold Danzig

This paper focuses on the results of a study examining the relationship among gender, leadership style and principal selection. A sample of 64 Arizona elementary teachers participated in the study. Key issues related to gender and leadership style were identified through a literature review, teacher ratings of four fictitious principals, coded comments, and survey results. Independent samples t tests on mean ratings were used to determine statistical significance. Teachers selected principals based on leadership style rather than gender; reform principal applicants were rated significantly higher than traditional principal applicants by all teacher respondents. Although not statistically significant, gender was associated to respondent selections. Female teachers rated a female reform principal higher than males, and male teachers rated a male reform principal higher than females. Male teachers rated a traditional female principal higher than they rated a traditional male principal, suggesting a gender interaction.

Introduction

Does gender play a role in the relationships between teachers and principals in a school setting? Benn (1989) posited that there are two main gender expectations apparent in schools: Women are linked to mothering and caring and men are linked to power and authority. American school personnel expect both management and strong and effective leadership from principals and superintendents. The traditional leadership style identified with McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y (1960, as cited in Lunenburg & Ornstein, 2000) and Bennis' (1989) distinction between leadership and management provide frameworks for understanding a new paradigm of leadership. The traditional model is evolving into a participatory management associated with such feminine characteristics as warmth,

About the Authors

A native of Chicago, Illinois, *Dr. Debbi Burdick* received her Bachelor's degree from Western Illinois University where she was named the Outstanding Senior in Education, two masters degrees from Eastern Illinois University, where she was named the Outstanding Educational Administration graduate, and her doctorate from Arizona State University where the Arizona School Administrators honored her as the outstanding ASU doctoral student in Educational Leadership. Dr. Burdick has been an educator for over 30 years. While with the Decatur Public Schools (IL), she served as an elementary and middle school teacher, a teaching consultant and an elementary school principal. In 1988, she was chosen as a Christa McAuliffe Fellow by the U.S. Office of Education for her design of one of the first formal induction programs in the state of Illinois. In addition, Dr. Burdick served as a teaching consultant for the state of Illinois and was an adjunct instructor for Milikin University. Since moving to Arizona in 1995, she has been both an elementary and middle school principal and currently is the Associate Superintendent for the Cave Creek Unified School District. Dr. Burdick lives in Scottsdale, Arizona, with her husband, Gary. They have three grown children who also live in Arizona.

Arnold Danzig is associate professor of Educational Administration in the Division of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Arizona State University. He is currently the principal investigator of a \$1.8 three year USDoE Grant entitled "Learner-Centered Leadership for Language and Culturally Diverse Schools In High Needs Urban Settings." Dr. Danzig has been directly engaged in professional development activities and research on professional development and training for school leaders for over a decade. His work on leadership development explores the use of narrative to mentor school administrators and appears in the *International Studies of Educational Administration*, *Journal of Educational Administration*, *Educational Leadership*, and a chapter in the *2004 Yearbook of the National Council of Professors of Education Administration*. Prior to coming to Arizona State University, Dr. Danzig was the program chair of the Educational Leadership area at Colorado State University.

nurturing, caring and trusting. New ideas reinforce the need for the "feminine modality" (Spore, Harrison, & Haggerson, 2002) in 21st century organizations if they are to be successful, progressive and effective, whatever their product and business.

Has the entry of women in educational administration changed administrative practice? Perhaps. The new call for administrative leadership, which has taken hold concurrently with the push for gender equity, is how women have been stereotyped; it is a call for engagement, participation in decisions, paying attention to the human side of organizations, and raising the place of individual efficacy over organizational efficiency. The restructuring movement calling for the empowerment of teachers, site-based management, and decentralization of authority is in line with the positive stereotypes of female leadership. (Schmuck, 1995, pp. 213-214)

In the 1980s, the emphasis in leadership studies shifted to studying differences in style between men and women. Shakeshaft (1989) put forward the concept of a female organizational culture. Sadker, Sadker, and Klein (1991) asserted that female leadership styles were more effective than those of males in the operation of successful schools. They found women administrators characteristically exhibited valued qualities such as care and concern for others in the organization; an emphasis on teaching and learning; an increased focus on the monitoring and evaluation of student learning; resourcefulness and creativity in securing outside resources to promote improvement of instruction; a democratic, participative and collaborative style; and the effective fostering of connections to the school community. These qualities are associated with more innovative schools, and more reform minded school leaders.

Spencer (2001) recognized that the "gender relationships" between teachers and principals affect their interactions and exchanges. Female teachers were inhibited in interactions with male principals. Gilligan (1982) posited that men seek to know women through knowing themselves; women think that if they know others, they will come to know themselves. Gender affects how people perceive relationships, and perspectives differ for men and women. An American teaching force that is overwhelmingly female, and an administration that is dominated by males, makes differences in perspectives and relationships predictable. In order for communication and trust to develop, gender perceptions, stereotypes, and characteristics must be understood and, if necessary, challenged, in order to develop a healthy and sustaining organizational culture.

Gender and Educational Administration: A Brief Review

Feminist theory, along with other post-modernist perspectives, describes organizational research and theories as male-dominated, male-gendered, and supporting male ways of knowing. Feminists assert that the prevailing norms

in organizations reproduce the systems of male domination, and bureaucratic rules, procedures, and rationality reproduce male manners of power and control (Blackmore, 1989). Individuals are viewed as commodities, appreciated only for their contributions to the achievements of the organization. Ferguson (1984) viewed feminist discourse as embracing values of care, connection and commitment to participatory democracy in opposition to organizations that reproduce patriarchy.

In schools, administrators, who were first socialized as teachers, hold strong beliefs about what men and women do there. In the first half of the 20th century, stereotypes against women were a major factor in the limited number of women administrators. Women were considered unable to maintain order or impart discipline because of their smaller stature and purported lack of strength (Shakeshaft, 1989). Men were considered better at working with the external community issues and with *difficult* issues. Men were seen as able to take charge more capably than women and also viewed as better at establishing contact with students, especially males. Women were viewed as better teachers and men as better managers.

The research of Eagly, Karau, and Johnson (1992) found the most significant gender difference in leadership style was the tendency for female principals to lead in a more democratic and less autocratic style than their male counterparts. Women were inclined to act in a collegial manner and actively bring in other constituents to take part in decision-making. Shakeshaft (1989) found that female superintendents spent more time in classrooms than male superintendents, and female principals spent more time with novice educators with instructional difficulties than did their male counterparts. Women educational leaders, using the feminine traits of inclusion, collegiality and webbing, also appear more comfortable in the role of instructional leader than males (Eagly, Karau, et al., 1992). Bell and Chase (1989) found that women superintendents defined the school organization as being about people and attempted to de-emphasize hierarchies and increase participation and staff development.

Loden (1985) described Rosener and Schwartz's dominant Alpha leadership style as more male dominant and the Beta style as more female dominant. The Alpha is analytical, rational, and quantitative driven. The Alpha is structured through hierarchy and relies on prescribed solutions for problem solving. However, Betas synthesize, add the dimension of intuition to decision-making, think qualitatively, and utilize integrated solutions in problem solving situations (Regan, 1995). Regan dubbed the feminist attributes of leadership, "relationship leadership," and identified five components: collaboration, caring, courage, intuition, and vision. She called

for a double helix model of leadership in which the best of male and female traits is blended into an optimal leader regardless of gender.

Transformational Leadership and Gender

Transformational leaders rely heavily on collegiality (a feminine associated style) and practices benefiting all leaders and their organizations (Rosener, 1990). Women leaders tend to talk more about the “web of connections which emphasizes empowerment, affirms relationships, seeks ways to strengthen human bonds, simplifies communications and gives means an equal value with ends” (Helgesen, 1990, p. 52). In a web structure of management, the figurehead is the heart, and top down layers are not necessary to reinforce status. Influence comes from connections to the people around, encouraging a team approach. The feminine values of inclusion and connection are now viewed as current valuable leadership traits. Additional feminine leadership characteristics are caring, using intuition to aid decision-making, and reducing emphasis on traditional management structures.

Transformational leadership style may be more congenial to women because its communal behaviors assist female leaders with the specialized difficulties of lesser authority and legitimacy that they encounter in the workplace more often than do males. Considerable research has shown women facing negative reactions and dislike in leadership roles, especially when they use authority over men, demonstrate high levels of ability, or use a dominant manner of communication (Eagly & Karau, 2002). Such negative responses can be decreased when female leaders display warmth and lack of self-interest by smiling, supporting others, and expressing interest in helping others meet their personal goals (Carli, 2001). Contingent reward behaviors, such as praising subordinates’ well-done performances, can also further positive work relationships (Eagly, Johannesen-Schmidt, & van Engen, 2003).

The reform, or modern leader, encompasses a list of qualities that typically have been attributed to the female styles of leadership. These attributes position the contemporary leader to lead in a web of connections and relationships, fitting with modern day organizations. Through traits such as caring, collaboration and communication, personal associations foster creative systems with the ability to respond to fluid environments.

Gender-Centered Perspectives

The gender-centered perspective posits that individual attributes vary according to their gender (Betz & Fitzgerald, 1987, as cited in Carless, 1998)

and women develop a feminine style of leadership that is distinguished by caring and nurturance. Men have been generalized to have a masculine style of leadership that is dominating and task-oriented (Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992). Social role theory (Eagly, 1987) proposes that individuals behave in the manner that society expects them to behave, as defined by their gender. As women have assimilated into school leadership, they have fostered alternative styles to educational leadership and have redesigned the format of management and leadership for all administrators (Enomoto, 2000). The feminine representation of leadership is comprised of characteristic transformational leadership behaviors of collaboration, democratic decision-making and meaningful relationships between the leader and her subordinates (Helgesen, 1990). There are researchers, however, who suggest this style may simply fit the new paradigm of leadership espoused by newer or younger managers (Shakeshaft, 1999). The structural perspective suggests that the organizational position of the individual is more significant than the gender of that individual (Kanter, 1977). Therefore, in an organization, the managers must meet the expectations prescribed and avoid conformance to the gender roles. Consequently, when comparing gender differences in leadership, the comparisons must be made between men and women who hold the same positions at the same level in the hierarchy in the organization (Carless, 1998).

Leadership and Caring

Noddings (1984) wrote of practical ethics from the feminine view and focused on caring—what it means to care and be cared for. She clarified, however, that “all humanity can participate in the feminine as I am describing it” (p. 172). In order to care, one must have a relationship of a sort—reciprocity. The “one-caring” has a recipient in the “cared-for.” Noddings viewed ethical caring as the “relation in which we do meet the other morally” (p. 4). Ethics has historically been expressed in a masculine voice, focusing on principles such as fairness and justice. Men are said to use the approach based on rules and principles to unravel moral dilemmas. Women may ask for more information when having to decide a moral question. They want to discuss the issue with those involved in order to “feel” along with them. To keep her receptivity, the one-caring is cautious of conventions and principles. Because of this more subjective approach to ethics and morality, women have been considered as second-rate when compared to men in this domain (Kohlberg, 1971, as cited in Noddings, 1984).

Noddings (1984) quoted Gilligan (1982) in her description of the feminine caring approach: “Women . . . judge themselves in terms of their

ability to care. Woman's place in man's life cycle has been that of nurturer, caretaker, and helpmate, the weaver of those networks of relationships on which she in turn relies" (p. 96). Women are better able to cope with caring than men due to the deep, psychological structures inherent in the mother-child relationship. Noddings' (1984) ethical ideal comes from two thoughts: natural sympathy and the need to enhance the most caring moments we have felt. Caring is grounded in relation—any moral dilemmas becoming shared with the one-caring. Moral decisions may be decided only through the ethical ideal of caring. The one-caring teaches the cared-for by talking about feelings: hers, his, and others. She listens with intensity and gives nonjudgmental advice. She is nurturing. Dialogue, reflection, and practice are crucial for the cared-for. The one-caring is the model and she is committed to the reciprocity that is the defining issue in ethical caring. Noddings posited girls learn these skills through their relationship with their mothers. Boys are often destined to the "impersonal and abstract" worlds of their fathers (p. 123). Mothering and caring are seen as intertwined.

School culture and the ethic of care. The culture of a school has rituals and communication patterns that are unique to the feminine culture (Bernard, 1981, as cited in Valentine, 1995). School cultures link the private world of home with the public world of the workplace. Helgesen (1990) found women to be better managers because of the experiences and expectations of motherhood that they bring with them to the workplace. Motherhood is excellent training for the skills of "organization, pacing, balancing of conflicting claims, teaching, guiding, leading, monitoring, handling disturbances, and imparting information" (pp. 31-32). Mothers find there is always something new to be included into the day, and there is not the expectation of complete control of a daily schedule. Since the days when men were hunters, their work lasted from daybreak to sundown. Yet the women in the hunter-gatherer societies saw their work as continuous and unending, leading them to have more of a process orientation where the emphasis was on the process rather than the closure.

Gender Differences in School Administrators

The literature includes numerous qualitative studies of female educational administrators and the view that women bring favorable practices to the school organizations that have not existed in the past but are essential for school reform (Regan & Brooks, 1995; Sadker et al., 1991). However, it must be noted that few of these studies provide comparable data from males; therefore, answers to questions about gender-related approaches to leadership are not conclusively answered. Fuchs Epstein (1988) argued that the differences between men and women are deceptive, and the overlap between

men and women on almost every measured characteristic make it impossible to recognize categorical attributes that apply universally to all females or all males. When males or females are in similar situations and working under matched expectations, they tend to behave in similar ways. Kanter (1977) believed that stereotyping women as “better” is as limited as thinking they are inferior; such beliefs widen the distance between men and women.

Both males and females exhibit different strengths and have different needs, yet gender stereotypes hamper both men and women (Sadker, 2002). There is a general cultural attitude that men are superior leaders, and many studies have concluded that neither men nor women want to work for a woman (Kanter, 1977). In a 1999 study, Rudman and Glick measured fictitious applicants for “feminine” and “masculine” high-status positions, as described in job descriptions. Male applicants were rated higher than female applicants overall despite a requirement for feminine traits in certain job descriptions. Yet, in other studies evaluating leadership styles, there appears to be no significant preference for men or a noted propensity to perceive men and women differently. When hearing that a new principal will be hired for a school, researchers have found that subordinates hope against the new leader being a woman and then admit their surprise when a woman is appointed and successful at leadership (Fauske & Ogawa, 1987). The preconceptions that are established about leaders and leadership wield potent control over their conclusions and behaviors, even when they are subconscious (Schein, 1985, as cited in Hart, 1995). Shakeshaft (1986) reported that “women . . . are likely to view the job of principal or superintendent as that of a master teacher or educational leader while men view it from a managerial, industrial perspective” (p. 118).

Differences in expectations. A study by Rosen and Jerdee (1973, as cited in Kanter, 1977) found that employees who have worked for a female are more likely than those who have not, to have favorable opinions toward women leaders. Also, women are slightly more accepting of having a women supervisor than are males. People, however, prefer the powerful as noted above and low power can have a negative effect on morale. Therefore, a preference of men may be a preference for power in organizations where women do not hold equal levels of power. Kanter supposed that followers may rate male leaders higher to credit them “imagined future payoffs” (p. 200).

Summary

This review of literature drew upon the Chinese proverb from Helgesen’s, *The Female Advantage* (1990): “Women hold up half the sky” (p. xli). This

view suggests that women do half the work and thinking in the world, and, for the sky to be whole, both halves must work together. Multiple perspectives originating from both the masculine and feminine facets of life are vital in the restructuring of schools. It is essential to understand how gender is related to school leadership, and how leadership is associated with the gender perceptions and expectations of followers.

The Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between gender and elementary teachers' selections of principal candidates. Do elementary school teachers select and rate their principals based on gender and/or leadership style? Are there differences among male and female teachers' expectations? The following sub-questions served as guidelines for the study.

1. Are traditional principal candidates rated differently than reform principal candidates?
2. Are male principal candidates rated differently than a matched group of female principal candidates?
3. Do male and female teacher respondents rate leaders differently?
4. Are there interactions among leadership style, applicant gender, and respondent gender? Specifically,
 - a. Is there an interaction between the gender of teacher respondents and the leadership style of the principal applicants?
 - b. Is there an interaction between the gender of teacher respondents and the gender of principal applicants?
 - c. Is there an interaction among the gender of the teacher respondents, leadership style, and the gender of principal candidates?
5. Are there differences in selections based on respondent experiential and demographic variables?

Research Methodology

To determine whether gender or leadership style was associated with the selection of an elementary principal by elementary school teachers, teachers were asked to make a hiring decision from a traditional manager style or a reform-innovative, participative style, without the knowledge that the researcher was looking at the choice of gender. The researcher explored both the gender of the selected principal and the gender of the respondents. This quasi-experimental design study (see Figure 1) utilized quantitative research

methods to answer questions. Fictitious principal candidate packets, consisting of a cover letter, vita, and job application, were designed by the researcher to represent a female traditional candidate, a male traditional candidate, a female reform candidate, and a male reform candidate. A jury of ten acting or former elementary school principals reviewed the designed packets and survey tool. Jurors were asked to (a) review the packets for how well they captured leadership style, (b) suggest modifications, and (c) to note the time it took to complete the reading of the packet and the survey tool. In addition, a “think aloud” technique was used with a group of four teachers to pilot test and validate the instruments (Haladyna, 1999).

What?

Do elementary school teachers select (or choose) their principals based on gender and/or leadership style?

With Whom?

A convenience sample stratified by gender was used. Subjects were 64 elementary school teachers in Maricopa County, Arizona Schools divided into four subgroups

How?

In an experimental design study, the teachers read one principal candidate packet and decided whether or not they would recommend for hire the fictional candidate. They then rated the candidate on five levels of performance and responded to survey and demographic questions. Independent variables of gender of the principals, gender of the respondents and leadership style were compared by means and *t* tests.

Figure 1. Research design.

Principal candidate packets with demographic survey and principal choice form were sent to a convenience sample, stratified by gender, of elementary schoolteachers in a major metropolitan center in the southwestern United States. Packets were divided among four subgroups. The four principal candidate packets were evaluated by four groups of 16 teachers with equal numbers of males and females. Each subgroup of teachers received one of the four principal candidate packets: female-traditional,

male-traditional, female-innovative, or male-innovative. Teachers reviewed the packets and then completed a response survey. They indicated whether or not they would hire the principal represented in their packets, and they rated the candidate on a 5-point scale. They also explained their recommendation for hiring. In addition, demographic information was requested on the response survey, isolating gender, age, years of teaching experience, and experience working for male and female principals.

Population and Sample

This study used elementary teachers from the metropolitan area for its population. The sample was taken from 11 area school districts: three small to midsize inner-city, central districts; three mid-size to large, urban districts; and five mid-sized to large suburban districts. The districts were chosen for their easy access by the researcher. The initial pool of subjects was volunteers. Principals or individual teachers of the schools were sent an email by the researcher that briefly explained the study and asked that it be forwarded to other teachers on the staff. The study of leadership was used as the rationale for the study with no mention of an interest in understanding gender. Interested teachers were asked in the email to contact the researcher directly via email or phone if interested in participating in the study.

From the pool of respondents, equal numbers of male teachers (32) and female teachers (32) were used for a self-selected, convenience sample stratified by gender. From these two gender groups, 4 groups of equal size and gender were formed with each group containing 8 males and 8 females.

Female participants were easy to locate; the necessary number responded within 24 hours. However, there were considerably fewer male elementary teachers available and finding 32 male volunteers was difficult. A second request, specifically asking for male participants, was made to identify the necessary number of male participants.

Instrumentation

The principal candidate packets contained (a) application materials for fictitious principals applying for a principal position in a fabricated state school district. Four different principal characters were invented: two candidates of the same innovative leadership style, but of opposite genders, and two candidates of the same traditional leadership style, but of opposite genders. The reform principals were named Pamela Peterson and Perry Peterson. The traditional principals were named Andrea Anderson and Andrew Anderson. Participating teacher respondents received only one of the packets depicting one leadership style and one gender. Each packet included

a cover letter describing the style of the candidate, a detailed job application for the position of principal, and a detailed vita outlining the candidate's professional history (see note at end of this article).

Careful attention was given to use language in the cover letters, vitas, and applications that described a traditional leader for one female and male principal candidate; reform descriptors were used for the other innovative female and male principal candidate. Language for the traditional candidates included verbs, such as *designed, implemented, organized and ran, oversaw, led, evaluated, and presented and instituted*. Verbs for the reform principals were *introduced, facilitated, assisted, fostered, and coached*. Additional skills and educational jargon were used that separated the two forms of leadership. For the traditional candidates, *clinical supervision of staff, essential elements of instruction, qualified evaluator trainer, effective school budgeting, designing teacher supervision instruments, effective manager, efficient management, budgetary efficiency, and raised test scores* were used. For the reform principal, skills highlighted were *working closely with staff, collegial models, teacher mentoring, strong coaching relationships, interpersonal communications, team-building, strong listening skills, working well with people, facilitating consensus decision-making, empowering staff, and collaboration*. The dissertation title for the traditional principals was *Financing Arizona Schools*. The dissertation title for the reform principals was *Principals and School Climate*.

The application was developed after a review of actual administrative applications from eight different local area school districts. The vitae were designed based on a review of the vitae of the researcher and two other practicing administrators.

The demographic survey was a one-page instrument designed to gather demographic information about the teacher respondents. Surveys were returned along with the consent form and rating/comment sheet. Seven questions were asked in a category format in which respondents checked the appropriate categories of demographic data that pertained to sample subjects personally: age, gender, years of teaching, positions held, current position, number of principals subjects had worked for, and the gender of those principals.

Sample respondents were asked (a) to identify the name of the fictitious principal identified in their principal candidate packet, and (b) decide whether or not they would recommend that the targeted candidate be hired as a principal. Respondents were then asked to explain in an open response format (a) why or why not they would choose the candidate and (b) what positive or negative attributes they identified. A 5-point rating scale ranging

from excellent to poor was included. Space for additional comments was provided.

The pool of participating teachers was stratified by gender and then each randomly assigned to one of two groups into four groups of 16 with 8 males and 8 females in each of the four groups. Each group was sent a principal candidate packet, the two instruments and the accompanying participation letter and consent form through the U.S. Mail. Teachers were matched to principal types through random assignment. All male participant names were placed in an envelope and all female participant names placed in a separate envelope. The four principal names were placed in another four envelopes with sixteen of each name in each envelope (Perry, Pam, Andrew and Andrea). A female name was pulled and matched to Perry; a male name was pulled and matched to Perry. A female name was pulled and matched to Pam; a male name was pulled and matched to Pam. This continued through Andrew and Andrea and then started over with Perry until all female and male names had been pulled and matched to each of the four principal names.

Findings

Demographics

The demographic information survey contained eight questions: age, gender, years of teaching, grades taught/positions held, current position, number of principals worked for, female principals worked for, and male principals worked for. Tables 1 and 2 display the demographic data. The age span of the sample was 23 years to 62 years. The mean age of the sample ($N = 64$) was 45 years with the female sample ($N = 32$) averaging 49 years of age and the male sample ($N = 32$) averaging 42 years of age. In all eight sub-groups, the female sample was older than the male sample. The greatest mean age difference was in the traditional male group ($N = 16$) with 14 years difference. The smallest mean age span was in the reform male sub-group ($N = 16$) with only one-year difference between males and females.

The female sample ($N = 32$) also had more teaching experience than the males with the females averaging 17 years to the males' 12 years. This was consistent in each sub-group pairing. The total sample ($N = 64$) averaged 15 years of teaching experience with a span of 1 year to 36 years. The largest mean experience difference was in the traditional female group ($N = 16$) with an average of 9 years difference. The smallest difference was in the reform male group ($N = 16$) with only one-year mean difference between males and females.

Table 1
Means for Demographic Data of Teacher Sample

Sub-group	Age (years)	Experience (years)	Principals #	Female Principals #	Male Principals #
<i>Traditional Male Principal</i>					
Females	50	15	5	3	2
Males	36	11	4	3	2
<i>Traditional Female Principal</i>					
Females	51	23	9	4	5
Males	43	14	4	2	2
<i>Reform Male Principal</i>					
Females	47	13	4	3	1
Males	46	12	4	3	1
<i>Reform Female Principal</i>					
Females	49	16	6	3	3
Males	43	12	7	4	3
All Females	49	17	6	3	3
All Males	42	12	5	3	2
Sample Mean	45	15	5	3	2

$N = 64$

Table 2
Years and Percentages of Teaching Experience of Teacher Sample

Assignment	Current	Previous
Primary	14 (22%)	30 (33%)
Intermediate	19 (30%)	43 (47%)
7th – 8th	6 (9%)	0 (0%)
Itinerant	2 (3%)	5 (5%)
Special Areas	14 (22%)	3 (3%)
Counseling/Social Work	2 (3%)	1 (1%)
Teacher on Assignment	4 (6%)	6 (7%)
Administrator	0 (0%)	4 (4%)
Special Education	3 (5%)	0 (0%)

$N = 64$

Table 3
Mean Ratings of Principals by Age Groups of Respondents

Sub-Group	<u>Age of Respondents in Years</u>	
	23-48	49-62
Traditional Male by Female Teachers	3.67	3.40
Traditional Male by Male Teachers	3.50	3.40
Total Group	3.56	3.43
Traditional Female by Female Teachers	3.00	3.67
Traditional Female by Male Teachers	3.80	4.00
Total Group	3.57	3.78
Reform Male by Female Teachers	4.40	4.33
Reform Male by Male Teachers	4.50	4.75
Total Group	4.44	4.57
Reform Female by Female Teachers	4.50	4.00
Reform Female by Male Teachers	4.20	4.33
Total Group	4.29	4.44
Total Sub-Group by Age	3.97	4.06

Note. males = 32, females = 32.

Teaching Experience of the Sample (N = 64)

The teaching sample had worked for an average of five principals. As a group, the females had worked for an average of six principals, whereas the males worked for an average of five. In all groups but one (reform male), the female teachers had worked for more principals than had the male teachers. The number of principals worked for ranged from 1 principal to 28. Women in the sub-groups had worked with more principals than the men except in one group (reform female) in which there only was a difference of one in the mean.

The sample (N = 64) had worked for more female principals than male principals (a mean for female principals 3 with a frequency range from 0 to 10). The female and male samples had worked for an average of three female principals. The mean for *male principals worked for* was two with an absolute frequency range from 0 to 18. The female teachers as a group had worked for an average of 3 male principals, the male teachers had worked for an average of 2 male principals. The mean range was from 1 to 5.

Table 4

Mean Ratings of Principals with Sample Grouped by Years of Experience

Sub-Group	<u>Years of Experience</u>	
	1-13	14-36
Traditional Male by Female Teachers	4.00	3.20
Traditional Male by Male Teachers	3.60	3.33
Total Group	3.75	3.25
Traditional Female by Female Teachers	3.00	3.57
Traditional Female by Male Teachers	3.80	4.00
Total Group	3.67	3.70
Reform Male by Female Teachers	4.40	4.30
Reform Male by Male Teachers	----	4.63
Total Group	4.40	4.55
Reform Female by Female Teachers	4.67	4.40
Reform Female by Male Teachers	4.20	4.33
Total Group	4.38	4.38
Total Sub-Group by Age	3.03	4.00

Note. Dashes indicate no respondents in this group; males = 27; females = 37

Teachers in the sample worked in elementary schools although the configurations of the schools ranged from grades Kindergarten-3, 4-8, Kindergarten-6 and Kindergarten-8 (see Table 2). Thirty percent of the sample were intermediate grade teachers, 22% of the sample special area teachers (physical education, art, music, band, and strings), and 22% primary grade teachers (kindergarten through 3rd). Seventh and eighth grade teachers made up 9% of the sample; teachers on assignment made up 6% of the sample; special education teachers made up 5% of the sample, itinerant staff (reading, English language learners, gifted) comprised 3% as did counselors/social workers (3%).

Research Questions

Findings are presented for each research question. Research #1 asked, "Are traditional principal candidates rated differently than reform principal candidates?"

The independent variable, leadership style, was defined as either traditional or reform style. The dependent variable, preference, was operationalized as ratings of participants on two measures, style and hiring. Respondents were asked to "rate" the candidate whose materials they were

reviewing by applying a Likert scale from 1 (low) to 5 (high) on five levels of preference for the style of leadership. Respondents were asked to indicate a hiring preference decision.

Based on a rating scale of 1 to 5, the reform principals were rated higher than the traditional principals by the 32 member sample. The reform group, both male and female, received a mean rating of 4.4; the traditional group, both male and female, received a mean rating of 3.6. The mean values were subjected to a t test; respondents indicated a significantly greater preference for reform principals than for traditional principals (mean difference = 0.8, $p < .001$).

Respondents were also asked to "rate" the candidates by answering the following question: "Would you seriously consider hiring this candidate?" Based on a dichotomous decision of hiring ("yes" or "no"), 100% of the sample that received reform principal candidate packets ($N = 32$) indicated that they would hire the reform candidate. Based on a dichotomous decision of hiring ("yes" or "no"), 84% ($N = 26$) of the sample that received traditional principal candidate packets ($N = 32$) indicated that they would consider hiring the traditional candidate; 13% ($N = 5$) of the sample ($N = 32$) indicated that they would not hire the candidate. One response was not usable.

Research question #2 asked, "Are male principal candidates rated differently than a matched group of female principal candidates?" When examining whether male principal candidates were rated higher or lower on the desirability than were a matched group of female principal candidates, the combined mean value for the female traditional and reform principal candidates (Andrea and Pam) was 4.1. The combined mean value for the male traditional and reform principal candidates was 4.45.

Furthermore, there was no significant difference between mean rating values for traditional male and female principal candidates (3.5 and 3.7, respectively, $p < 0.5$) nor for reform male and female principal candidates (4.6 and 4.4, respectively, $p < 0.5$).

Research question #3 asked, "Do male and female teacher respondents rate leaders differently?" Regardless of gender, the male respondents ($N = 32$) rated the traditional principals higher (mean of 3.7) than did the female respondents ($N = 32$) by a mean difference of 0.2. There was no difference, however, in the mean ratings by men and women respondents for reform principals. Both gender groups substantially rated the reform candidates higher than they rated the traditional candidates; the male respondents indicated a mean difference of 0.7 and the female respondents indicated a mean difference of 0.9.

Research question #4 asked, “Are there interactions among leadership style, applicant gender, and respondent gender? Specifically,

1. Is there an interaction between the gender of teacher respondents and the leadership style of the principal applicants?
2. Is there an interaction between the gender of teacher respondents and the gender of principal applicants?
3. Is there an interaction among the gender of the teacher respondents, leadership style, and the gender of principal candidates?”

No significant interactions were found. However, the following observations about mean rankings were noted.

- No differences in ratings of male and female respondents for the male traditional principal candidates were found.
- Male respondents provided a more favorable mean rating (3.88) than did female respondents (3.50) for the female traditional principal candidate.
- Male respondents provided a more favorable mean rating (4.63) than did female respondents (4.38) for the male reform principal candidate. Male respondents provided a less favorable mean rating (4.25) than did the female respondents (4.50) for the female reform principal candidate.

Research question #5 asked, *Are there differences in selections based on respondent experiential and demographic variables?*

There were no statistically significant differences in selections based on respondents’ demographic variables as illustrated in Tables 3 and 4. In all groups, the reform principals were rated higher than the traditional principals.

Through a two-tailed *t* test done on mean values, the major finding of this study was that principal selection by elementary teachers is most related to leadership. Reform principals were rated higher than traditional principals. Furthermore, gender of the principal candidate and/or gender of the teacher was not statistically significant when choosing a principal. Although there were some differences when comparing demographic data, these factors were not significant in principal selection. In the traditional principal group, male respondents rated the female principal higher than the female respondents. In the traditional male groups, there was no difference in rating between males and females. In the reform groups, the male respondents rated the male principal higher than the female respondents and the female respondents

rated the female principal higher than the male respondents. Primary teachers were highly represented in the reform sub-groups. Overall, the hopeful finding is that gender appears less important than principal leadership experience and actions. This is a change from the previous generation of school administrators when gender trumped experience and values.

Decision-Supporting Comments From Respondents

A total of 272 comments were offered by the respondents. Not all respondents commented, and some made multiple comments. The respondents who were reviewing principal packets offered more positive comments than negative comments. Approximately 56% of the comments were about traditional candidates; and 44% were about reform candidates. There were 99 positive comments and 55 negative comments—an approximate 2:1 ratio—about traditional principals. There were 102 positive comments and 16 negative comments—an approximate 6:1 ratio—about the reform principals. Respondents were more inclined to speak negatively about traditional candidates than about reform candidates. When the comments were distributed across gender groups, the respondents made more comments about males than female candidates and the comments were inclined to be more positive than negative. There were 109 positive comments and 40 negative comments about male principal candidates—an approximate 2.7: 1 ratio. There were 92 positive comments and 31 negative comments—an approximate 3:1 ratio—about women principal candidates.

Implications

We began this study with an interest in gender that had developed through experiences as spouses and parents and broadened in our professional lives as educators. The focus of the study was initiated from the curiosity of whether or not elementary teachers selected their principals for their gender or their leadership style. The study results were encouraging in that the modern day teachers in this sample have moved past gender issues to the qualities in a leader that impact a high quality school system.

Teachers in this study initially and significantly chose their principals by leadership style rather than gender. However, a slight preference for feminine leadership characteristics filtered into their partiality. In order to build a productive learning community and a culture that emphasizes teaching and learning in elementary schools, the building educational leader, specifically the principal, must meet the challenges through modern leadership. No longer is the building principal simply a manager but as the educational leader, she must use the tenets of reform to foster a focus on student

achievement through innovative and research based instructional methods. In order to center teachers on instructional methods and materials that have been proven effective and train them through valuable professional development, the principal must first and foremost, be an expert communicator who can teach her diverse staff, just as the teachers teach their diverse learners.

Effective communicators affect change and foster reform through listening, caring, collaborating, training, modeling, and connecting with staff. These are all characteristics of the new educational leader represented by the reform principal candidates created for this study. They are also typically feminine characteristics as documented through inquiry and observation in what Shakeshaft calls “a woman’s way of leading” (1999, p. 116).

All principals, male or female, must meet the mounting challenges of 21st century schools by embracing the new paradigm of leadership. The business manager prototype no longer fits the requirements for effective school leadership. Teachers want the empowered partnerships encouraged by reform leadership. They want to have powerful conversations with their principal along with collegial respect. They practice reflective discussion and even collegial disagreement with their principals in the spirit of thoughtful practice and accelerating student achievement. Schools are becoming active learning communities where every educator in the school, from novice to master teacher to principal, works as an informed team member and an educational model for others in the education quest. Just as “women hold up half the sky” (Helgesen, 1990, p. xli), men hold up the other half. Regardless of gender, principals must embrace the softer side of leadership as compared to top-down management in order to connect, motivate, and elevate their educational teams.

NOTE

If readers are interested in the information in principal packets, please contact the author, Deborah Burdick, Associate Superintendent of Learning Systems, Cave Creek Unified School District, PO Box 426, Cave Creek, AZ 85327; Phone: 480-575-2018, Fax: 480-488-7055; or email dburdick@ccusd93.org

REFERENCES

- Bell, C. S., & Chase, S. E. (1989). *Women as educational leaders: Resistance and conformity*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

- Benn, C. (1989). Preface. In H. DeLyon & F. W. Mignuolo (Eds.), *Women teachers: Issues and experiences* (pp. xviii-xxvi). Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Bennis, W. (1989). *On becoming a leader*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus.
- Blackmore, J. (1989). Educational leadership: A feminist critique and reconstruction. In J. Smyth (Ed.), *Critical perspectives on educational leadership* (pp. 93-103). London: Falmer.
- Carless, S. A. (1998). Gender differences in transformational leadership: An examination of superior, leader, and subordinate perspectives. *Sex Roles*, 39, 887-902.
- Carli, L. L. (2001). Gender and social influence. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57, 725-741.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behaviour: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, 109, 573-598.
- Eagly, A. H., Karau, S. J., & Johnson, B. (1992). Gender and leadership style among school principals: A meta-analysis. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 28(1), 76-102.
- Eagly, A. H., Johannesen-Schmidt, M. C., & van Engen, M. L. (2003). Transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership styles: A meta-analysis comparing women and men. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 569-591.
- Eagly, A. H., Makhijani, M. G., & Klonsky, B. G. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 111, 3-22.
- Enomoto, E. K. (2000). Probing educational management as gendered: An examination through model and metaphor. *Teachers College Record*, 102(2), 375-397.
- Fauske, R. Jr., & Ogawa, R. T. (1987). Detachment, fear, and expectation: A faculty's response to the impending succession of its principal. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26(4), 345-375.
- Ferguson, K. (1984). *The feminist case against bureaucracy*. Philadelphia: Temple University.
- Fiore, T. A., & Curtin, T. R. (1997). *Public and private school principals in the United States: A statistical profile, 1987-88 to 1993-94*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- Fuchs Epstein, C. (1988). *Deceptive distinctions: Sex, gender and the social order*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Haladyna, T. (1999). *Development and validity of multiple choice test items*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hart, A. W. (1995). Women ascending to leadership: The organizational socialization of principals. In D. M. Dunlap & P. A. Schmuck (Eds.), *Women leading in education* (pp. 105-124). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Helgesen, S. (1990). *The female advantage: Women's ways of leadership*. New York: Doubleday.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation* (2nd ed.). New York: Perseus.
- Loden, M. (1985). *Feminine leadership or how to succeed in business without being one of the boys*. Toronto: Random House.
- Lunenburg, F. C., & Ornstein, A. C. (2000). *Educational administration: Concepts and practices*. Stamford, CT: Wadsworth.
- McGregor, D. (1960). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics & moral education*. London, England: University of California Press.
- Regan, H. B. (1995). In the image of the double helix: A reconstruction of schooling. In D. M. Dunlap & P. A. Schmuck (Eds.), *Women leading in education* (pp. 407-422). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Regan, H. B., & Brooks, G. H. (1995). *Out of women's experience: Creating relational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Rudman, L. A., & Glick, P. (1999). Feminized management and backlash toward agentic women: The hidden costs to women of a kinder, gentler image of middle management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 1004-1010.
- Sadker, D. (2002). An educator's primer on the gender war. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 84(3), 235-240, 244.
- Sadker, M., Sadker, D., & Klein, S. (1991). The issue of gender in elementary and secondary education. In G. Grant (Ed.), *Review of research in education* (pp. 269-334). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

- Schmuck, P. A. (1995). Advocacy organizations for women school administrators. In D. M. Dunlap & P. A. Schmuck (Eds.), *Women leading in education* (pp. 199-234). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Shakeshaft, C. (1986). Female organizational culture. *Educational Horizons*, 64(3), 117-122.
- Shakeshaft, C. (1989). *Women in educational administration*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Shakeshaft, C. (1999). The struggle to create a more gender-inclusive profession. In J. Murphy & K. Seashore Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp. 99-118). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Snyder, T. D. (2002). Trends in education. *Principal*, 82(1), 52-55.
- Spencer, D. A. (2001). Teachers' work in historical and social context. In V. Richardson (Ed.) *Handbook on research in teaching* (pp. 803-825). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Spore, M., Harrison, M., & Haggerson, N. Jr. (2002). *Stories of the academy: Learning from the good mother*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Valentine, P. (1995). Women's working worlds: A case study of a female organization. In D. M. Dunlap & P. A. Schmuck (Eds.), *Women leading in education* (pp. 340-357). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Where are the Women in School Administration? Issues of Access, Acculturation, Advancement, Advocacy

Dianne L. Hoff
Catherine Menard
Jeanna Tuell

Despite widespread alarms about a growing shortage of school leaders, an obvious source of well-prepared talent continues to be overlooked. Women are still under-represented in school administration, particularly at the highest levels of responsibility. This paper presents findings of a study that examined issues for women in accessing administrative positions, acculturating into the organization, advancing on the hierarchical ladder, and advocating for other women who may follow. The results suggest that the administrative profession, including women themselves, would benefit from a more sophisticated understanding of the gender biases that still persist to keep women on the operational and cultural margins of school organizations.

Across the country, school officials struggle to attract and retain enough talented educational leaders. Increased demands for accountability, long hours, decreased autonomy, and lack of support are driving some to leave administrative roles, or to decide not to enter administration in the first place (Adams, 1999; Normore, 2004). Studies also reveal that many school leaders are nearing retirement (Cooper, Fusarelli, & Carella 2000; RAND Corporation, 2003), and states across the country report shrinking administrative applicant pools (NAESP, 2003). The shortage of school leaders, therefore, appears to be real, yet it is hard to imagine how this can be so. Our schools are full of talented teachers, and university leadership preparation programs are thriving. A properly prepared talent pool *does* exist, and statistics show that this pool consists increasingly of women, who for some time have represented the largest percentage of both the teaching profession and educational leadership preparation programs (Grogan &

About the Authors

Dianne L. Hoff, Ed.D, is Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership at the University of Maine, where she teaches graduate courses in a variety of areas, including school law, finance, policy analysis, and organizational behavior. She conducts research on the social/political context of schooling, with a focus on how law, policy, norms, and practice intersect and affect patterns of discrimination and marginalization in education. Prior to her faculty appointment, Dianne had been a high school teacher in Indiana and then a principal in large schools in Georgia and California.

Catherine Menard is a doctoral candidate at the University of Maine and is currently conducting research on the assimilation of curriculum coordinators into educational hierarchies. She is the Curriculum Coordinator for Maine School Administrative District #31 in Howland, Maine.

Jeanna Tuell is a doctoral candidate at the University of Maine, where she is currently researching the extent to which administrative relationships affect teachers' job satisfaction. She has been a teacher, school board member, and school administrator in several communities, including her current role as principal in Old Town, Maine.

Brunner, 2005; Shakeshaft 1999). Yet women remain underrepresented in leadership roles, particularly in high school principalships and superintendencies, the positions that carry the most responsibility and influence (Grogan & Brunner 2005; Keller, 1999). It appears the shortage of administrators can only be explained if qualified women are going unnoticed. Where, then, *are* the women in school administration?

Studies suggest that female applicants often face ongoing misperceptions about their lack of leadership strength, particularly in non-academic areas such as facilities, athletics, and budget (Skrla, 2001). And some do not apply for leadership positions in the first place, finding themselves torn between the enormous demands of an administrative job and societal expectations for women in terms of family (Grogan, 1999; Tallerico, 2000). For those women who are successful in obtaining leadership positions, determining "how things are done here" and becoming accepted in the organization can be even more difficult. The newcomers must locate the boundaries between the cultural insiders and outsiders and identify the gatekeepers between those two domains (Gupton & Slick, 1996; Marshall & Kasten, 1994). Yet women

often find it difficult to locate the entry points to becoming cultural insiders, due to systemic norms that keep them on the margins (Johnson, 1997). Instead of seamless transitions, many female administrators face trials and frustrations as they attempt to simultaneously learn the job *and* the norms and culture of the organization, including who the players are, how best to fit in, and how to avoid the political and social land mines that can undermine their efforts to become accepted, successful members of the team.

The inherent challenges for anyone in educational leadership are compounded for women because school governance structures remain quite patriarchal (Tallerico, 2000). Johnson (1997) points out that white males still hold the majority of leadership positions in schools, particularly at the upper levels. Furthermore, the absence of mentoring or informal support systems for women may make integration and successful acculturation more difficult for them than for their male counterparts. Lacking this camaraderie and support, some women, in an attempt to gain a foothold, sacrifice their sense of self, consciously assuming traditionally masculine traits and behaviors—toughness, emotional detachment, and decisiveness. Some may even avoid association with women's groups that may be perceived as being divisive or separatist (Johnson, 1997; Tallerico, 2000). Facing “cultural and social discrimination,” coupled with feelings of “professional and organizational isolation” (Beekley, 1999, p. 173), some women leave their administrative positions altogether.

For those who stay in administration, obtaining positions as high school principals and superintendents can be an even greater challenge, as evidenced by the large under-representation of women in these roles. In 1999, for example, women constituted only about 12% of the superintendents in over 14,000 United States districts, an increase of only two percentage points since 1981 (Keller, 1999). By 2003, the percentage of female superintendents was still low at 18% nationwide (Grogan & Brunner, 2005). Career patterns contribute to this, since the path to the superintendency usually passes through the high school principalship, a position that remains a bastion of male leaders (Shakeshaft, 1989). Public perception persists that men are more skilled at handling political and disciplinary issues better, especially at the high school level (Logan, 1998). Women themselves believe that in order to attain a superintendency, they need to travel the conventional path — teacher to principal (especially a high school principalship), to assistant superintendent, coupled with a doctoral degree, sponsorship, professional visibility, and business experience (Grogan, 1996).

Finally, women may not be supporting one another for leadership roles. Instead of “sisterhood,” women are perceived as being their own worst

enemies, using underhanded and often devastating ways to attack each other (Chesler, 2002). This has the dual effect of hindering women's chances for success and reinforcing unproductive, negative stereotypes.

This study extends the analysis of the under-representation of women in leadership roles, particularly at the highest levels of responsibility. It focuses on the social and political impediments to women's advancement and examines the extent to which women support other women. Finally, it explores how well women themselves understand the systemic nature of gender barriers, since women are not likely to achieve parity with men until they grasp the nature of the problem.

The Study

The study was conducted in Maine, where the percentage of administrative positions held by women is 45%, which is an increase from 38% in 1995 (Maine Department of Education, 2004a). This statistic suggests to many, of course, that the faces of leadership are changing; thus, gender is not an issue in this state—at least in terms of school leadership. However, this finding is deceiving and fails to illustrate that the percentage of women holding administrative positions is just a small percentage (37%) of those who hold administrative certification. It also obfuscates the fact that the number of women who hold the most influential leadership positions—high school principalships and superintendencies—remains very low, at 17% for both roles (Maine Department of Education, 2004b).

Included in the study were nearly all K-12 female school administrators within the state of Maine. Surveys were sent to all female superintendents, high school principals, and middle school principals. However, for the purpose of providing number balance across administrative roles, stratified random sampling techniques were used to select the participants from the ranks of elementary principal and district mid-level administrators, which we defined as curriculum coordinators and special education directors.

The goal of the study was to elucidate women's perceptions of the barriers to acquiring and moving comfortably into school leadership roles. We examine career path and advancement issues for female administrators and explores the extent to which women are supporting one another. The total number of potential participants was 300, and our return rate was 58% (174), as follows:

Administrative Role	Number of Females in this Role Statewide	Statewide Percentage of the Total in This Role	Number of Surveys Sent	Number Responding to the Survey	Percentage Returning the Survey
Superintendents	30	17%	30	24	80%
High School Principals	28	17%	28	23	82%
Middle School Principals	82	58%	82	47	57%
Elementary Principals	235	51%	80*	43	54%
District Mid-Level Administrators	155	57%	80*	37	46%
Total			300	174	58%

*Selected by stratified random sampling covering all 4 quadrants of the state

The guiding questions for the study included:

- What are the career paths of female school administrators, and what do these patterns illuminate about barriers for women in obtaining school leadership positions?
- What cultural and political boundaries influence women's ability to gain insider status within school organizations?
- What are the perceptions of barriers to advancing into the highest administrative roles?
- To what extent do female leaders support other women who aspire to leadership roles?

Because this was exploratory data analysis, descriptive statistics were used to organize, summarize, and describe measures of the population. The administrative level and experience of respondents were revealed on the survey, which allowed for comparisons by categories. Open-ended responses were coded first according to research question, then by categories and themes, and finally clustered according to administrative role.

Findings

The women who responded identified a set of problems contributing to their under-representation in school leadership roles. These were in four categories, which we call The Four A's—access, acculturation, advancement, and advocacy.

Access to School Administrative Positions

Though women make up more than half the teaching force, their representation in leadership positions continues to lag significantly behind that of men. This is especially evident among high school principals and superintendents, where, in Maine, women currently hold 17% of both the high school principalships and superintendencies. Findings related to access to administrative roles include:

Women moved into their first administrative role either because an opportunity presented itself or because they were “nudged” into it.

In the study, 76% (132) of all respondents reported that they were either fortuitous (a position suddenly appeared in the district at an opportune time) or nudged into their first administrative role (colleagues encouraged them to apply), showing little change from Ortiz's 1982 finding that women are “frequently pushed into the principalship by sponsors” (p. 69). Fewer than 20% (34) reported that they intended from the start of their teaching career eventually to become an administrator.

When this finding is examined by role, however, some startling contrasts can be seen. Among female superintendents, 33% (10) stated it had been their plan to become an administrator from the outset of their careers. Although not a large percentage, this was significantly higher than respondents in other leadership positions, where only 16% (24) reported a career plan to move into administration. This indicates that women who obtain superintendencies are more often those who were purposeful about planning their careers, as compared to the majority who tended to move into their roles because they were asked to do so, or who considered moving into administration when an opportunity presented itself.

Women more often move into administration within the same district, rather than make inter-district career moves.

Sixty-nine percent (46) of first-time female administrators and 45% (50) of experienced female administrators have remained in the district where they have spent most, if not all, of their educational careers. Respondents noted the importance of the relationships they had built as one factor influencing this “immobility.” For example, “I’ve taken a lot of time to establish myself and build strong relationships. I value these and wouldn’t want to start over in another district.” This finding suggests little change during the past two decades since Edson (1988) noted that women were less willing than men to change districts for an administrative post and very unlikely to change states to do so. The tendency among women to remain in the same district is also explained by the previous finding of this study, which revealed that most female administrators had moved into leadership either serendipitously or by sponsorship, both of which are more likely to occur within the existing district.

Women reported internal barriers including their own need to be “super-prepared” before applying, and waiting for the time to be right in terms of family responsibilities.

Well over half of the respondents (62%/108) indicated that they delayed considering a move to administration until they could gain experience through many years of teaching, finish their entire leadership preparation program, and get their children to (or through) school-age. One respondent captured the sentiment of many, saying, “I was a teacher for sixteen years before becoming an assistant principal. I felt I needed that level of experience, and I wanted to spend time with my own children.”

Analysis and implications for access. The comfort of established relationships, along with not having to move, are factors that women in the study reported as appealing, and help explain the high number of women in the study who moved into their current role from within the same school district. This may also help explain why women do not ascend to the highest levels of administration as frequently as men do. Attaining a superintendency, for example, usually requires progression through several leadership positions and a willingness to move to districts with openings, as opposed to waiting for a vacancy in the local superintendency.

Late entry into administration also contributes to the lower percentage of women in the highest positions of educational administration. Since many female administrators believe they must prove themselves as teachers, finish their preparation programs, and wait for family responsibilities to wane

before applying for an administrative position—they tend to enter the superintendent “pipeline” several years later than men do. Research indicates that men tend to say they are ready to do the job earlier and with less formal preparation or leadership experience, and without waiting for family responsibilities to subside. Grogan and Brunner (2005), for example, found that female superintendents had spent more time in the classroom than their male counterparts, 40% of whom had been in the classroom five years or fewer. Women represent the majority in educational leadership programs and often put tremendous effort into improving their knowledge, skills, and credibility to be worthy of consideration. Ironically, this attention to preparation may actually be impeding their professional advancement.

Acculturation Within the Organization

In addition to women’s struggles in accessing positions, particularly at high levels of administration, this study revealed a perception by many women that they have a more difficult time than men in acculturating and gaining acceptance within the organization. Here are those findings:

Female administrators have very few professional support structures.

Despite the attention that mentors have been given among the ranks of teachers, 78% (136) of all respondents said they were not assigned a mentor when they moved into administration. We also cross-tabulated the data by years of experience, to see if providing mentors might be a newer phenomenon. However, 76% (150) of first time administrators reported they did not have a mentor (compared to 80% of experienced administrators), indicating that providing mentors for new administrators is not something that has gained a toe-hold within most school districts. Several respondents commented that this would have been helpful. One wrote, for example, that we need to “apply lessons of teacher induction to administration.”

Of those who were assigned a mentor, 68% (26) reported that the mentor had given them valuable insight about the “nuts and bolts” of the job, but only 29% (11) were given insight on more subtle cultural and political acculturation issues, such as the “potential land mines” they might confront. The study also revealed that support for women is not ongoing, with 97% (169) reporting they have no formal network that supports them as female administrators, and 40% (69) said they have no network at all, formal or informal.

Women tend to identify themselves as cultural outsiders when multiple factors of outsider-ism are present.

The good news is that 77% (134) of the women in the study self-reported as cultural “insiders.” On closer examination, however, this picture is not quite as positive. People who have been in their role for three years or fewer, for example, were nearly twice as likely to report they were cultural “outsiders,” and the same was true for women who had switched districts. And despite this reported “insider status,” 55% (96) indicated that in terms of acceptance, they were clearly at a disadvantage compared to men. One respondent said, for example, “I am new to the district . . . new males are accepted more easily.”

When asked why they considered themselves cultural insiders or outsiders, their written comments were consistent. *Insiders* attributed their status to two factors. First, many said they had been in the district a long time, and so believed that longevity made them insiders. As one put it, “My entire career in education (31 years) has been in the same district, which contributes to my sense of being an insider.” Another said, “I was a well-respected teacher and department chair, and now logically I am an administrative insider.” The second factor named was their “competence,” indicating that many respondents equated skill with insider status. More than 30 comments resembled this one: “I’m very capable, which has helped me be an insider.” It is troubling that virtually none of the answers from the self-identified “insiders” spoke to issues of being valued, being heard, being politically savvy, or feeling safe to challenge established norms.

Outsiders’ comments were also revealing. They indicated a perception that others resented them, particularly if they came from “away” (“It’s been hard to be accepted as a person who’s ‘new’ to the community”); or if they were named to a job that had been traditionally held by men (“The former superintendent was a male, so people seem suspicious of me”); or if they were young (“I am younger than most administrators—some seem to resent that”). When a respondent fell into several of these categories, she rated herself even lower on the insider/outsider continuum, indicating that combinations of these factors make outsider-ism worse.

Women consciously adopt characteristics more typically identified with masculinity in order to be accepted on the administrative team.

When asked whether they had to assume new leadership traits to achieve insider status, 80% (139) said they did. The traits selected were ones

traditionally associated with masculinity, including “decisiveness,” which was selected by 65% (115) of the respondents and “not showing emotion, appearing tougher,” selected by 40% (71). (The percentages reporting this were even higher with administrators who have been in their roles three years or fewer.) Other attributes named were “talking less” (20%), embracing traditionally masculine interests, e.g., sports (19%), and putting “relational distance between self and staff” (16%). On the flip side, written comments revealed a concern that “You can’t be a women’s libber and remain an insider,” expressing a fear that being seen as a vocal advocate for other women would cause them to be labeled as a “libber” or “feminist,” which would relegate them to the cultural periphery and hamper their ability to lead change.

It is also noteworthy that 52% (90) of respondents reported a perception that women have to be “better” or “more accomplished” than men to gain recognition and acceptance within the district, and in the case of high school and middle school principals, the number goes up to 58% and 59% respectively. As one respondent put it, “When I make a mistake, it’s brought up in an administrative team meeting, with an expectation that it will not happen again. When my male counterpart makes an error, there seems to be a “wink and smile” attitude, and someone else is assigned to pick up the slack.

Female school leaders believe that a “Good Ol’ Boys’ Network” exists in educational administration.

Seventy-four percent (128) said that a “good ol’ boys’ network” exists in school administration. In their comments, again and again, respondents qualified this by saying “not in my district, however,” expressing their belief that the network exists “elsewhere, not where I work,” or “not here, but across the state.” Further, respondents repeatedly named professional leadership associations as especially egregious.

Analysis and implications for acculturation. It is clear from the data that the mentoring picture, both formal and informal, is not improving for female administrators. Few reported the existence of a mentor, and for those who did, the mentor generally failed to inform them of important cultural and political insider information that would have helped them avoid pitfalls. Although we do not yet have comparative data for men, the finding is still especially problematic for women, who tend to depend on relationships for career advancement and enhancement.

From one perspective, however, the lack of mentoring could be viewed as a positive, in that women are not being “mentored” to be players in a system that perpetually disadvantages them and keeps them from top positions. However, this is only advantageous if women recognize these inequities and patterns, and there is little evidence from the responses we received that this level of awareness exists.

The fact that women self-report as cultural insiders is both a good news/bad news finding in regard to acculturation. It is positive that so many do feel comfortable as insiders within their organizations. However, most of the women who rated themselves as insiders have stayed within the same district for many years. They may have lost sight of what a new person might experience in terms of being on the cultural periphery. Longevity in any organization may cloud impartial judgment and blind employees to the cultural and political barriers that exist, not only for newcomers, but for particular individuals or groups of individuals within the organization, including women. This may explain why women comfortably remain in systems that are considered patriarchal by outsiders. Also telling is the degree to which women, including the “insiders,” reported that masculine traits (decisiveness, not showing emotion) equate with acceptance and insider status, and that most had consciously adopted one or more of these.

Perhaps most telling, was the degree to which a “not in my district” phenomenon arose throughout the data on acculturation issues. Women overwhelmingly agreed that a “good ol’ boys’ network exists, but we repeatedly received written clarification that this was happening “in other places, not here.” This narrow focus and separation of what goes on at the micro level compared to the macro level provides a way for women to ignore or dismiss a pattern of behavior that is detrimental to women’s entrance and acceptance into school organizations. Similarly, many reported that becoming an insider “isn’t a problem *here*,” failing to see that if a system seems to work for them, it may not be working for others within their own district, or that it may be operating in a broader context. This tendency to focus on one’s own experience and only at the micro level can be an avoidance strategy for having to see (and respond to) more systemic issues related to gender.

Advancement to the Highest Administrative Roles

We asked current female administrators about their perceptions of barriers that may exist for women in moving up the career ladder. The findings are as follows:

Female school leaders reported struggling with competing demands of family life.

Sixty-eight percent (119) of respondents indicated the struggle of maintaining a balance between personal and professional lives was a significant challenge, and this was fairly evenly distributed across all administrative roles. It was especially pronounced among those who held their current position for four years or fewer, where 71% (70) reported that finding a balance was a persistent struggle. One principal said that entering female administrators need to understand that “with the tension between career and the demands of family—sacrifices will be made.”

There was a clear implication from respondents that family responsibilities are still not gender-balanced, supporting research indicating that most females continue to shoulder the bulk of responsibilities associated with family and home life (Brunner, 2000). One remarked, “I think the professional vs. personal demands are not spoken out loud but are HUGE conflicts for women—and women are surrounded by men who do not share these experiences.” Even among those with supportive partners or spouses, and those who said their children had grown, 68% (118) indicated it was difficult to maintain relationships in their personal life while accepting new challenges, expansive work days, and increased professional obligations that accompany administrative roles, particularly at the high school and superintendent’s level. This tension will not subside until the model for educational administrators evolves to include more consideration for women’s routes to leadership and the extra responsibility they often carry for child raising and maintaining a healthy home environment.

The perception that there is one “correct route” to the superintendency may be contributing to the lack of advancement for women.

In the survey, an overwhelming 92% (160) of the respondents felt that the two administrative positions from which an administrator is most likely to rise to the superintendency are the high school principalship and, less frequently, central office positions such as curriculum coordinator. This belief, coupled with such a small increase in the number of women (at least in Maine) who are high school principals (17% of current high school principals compared to 16% in 1995) may indicate that the pool of female candidates for superintendencies will remain small. Further, only 15% of responding female high school principals indicated that they entered

administration with a career ladder in mind, which brings into question whether many have plans of becoming superintendents in the future, and thus shrinking the pool even further.

Respondents were divided on whether gender-related factors are still germane in terms of women advancing within the educational leadership hierarchy.

Responses were almost evenly divided when asked whether gender is a factor that influences advancement to the superintendency. We called this the “dog bone” effect, since the responses were skewed so dramatically to both ends of the continuum. On one end, 40% (70) expressed a strong belief that there are still many barriers for women in attaining influence and positional power within school districts. One wrote, “Much more research on the reasons so few women ascend to the superintendency needs to happen. The whole issue of gender seems to have faded from discussion.” Most others (58%/101) took the polar opposite position, indicating their belief that gender has nothing to do with career advancement, and expressing a mixture of denial (“There is no problem”), disbelief (“I can’t believe you still think this is a problem”) and/or anger (“I earned this job, and research about women diminishes my achievement”).

Analysis and discussion of advancement. The data indicate that women generally agree about the tension many females face in juggling the demands of administration and family life. There was further agreement that time spent as a high school principal increased the likelihood of being successful in obtaining a superintendency. However, more than half of the respondents seemed to just accept this as “the way things are,” not seeing how gender patterns may be contributing to fewer female applicants, or indeed, limiting the choices they or their female colleagues may have.

Of greater concern was the number of respondents who clearly believe that educational leadership operates completely within a meritocracy that allows anyone with the proper skills to advance, despite the fact that the numbers argue otherwise. “Gender is not an issue,” one stated, “women who work hard enough will succeed. Period.” Some qualified this with remarks like, “gender is not the issue *here* that it might be elsewhere,” indicating a belief that at the local level all is well.

Advocacy For Other Women

One important aspect of the study was to examine the degree to which women helped other women in terms of accessing, acculturating and advancing in leadership. The study reveals the following findings in terms of women advocating for each other:

Respondents do not feel that women support one another. In fact, respondents identified men as more inclusionary and claimed other women were often more exclusionary.

The survey reveals that 57% (86) reported that it was a male who had been the most inclusionary and tried to draw them into the organizational culture. This phenomenon was especially true for female superintendents and high school principals, where 73% and 70% respectively reported males to be the most inclusionary. This seems logical since there are more men in these roles, but consider that 57% (66) of the respondents also specifically named other women as “most exclusionary.” This troubling admission was particularly true again for superintendents (53%) and high school principals (65%).

One respondent noted, “I sometimes think that women are their own worst enemies because instead of encouraging one another, they gossip about one another—Women don’t leave matters behind, but carry a grudge too far.” Respondents used language such as “undercut,” “backbite,” or “weaken,” to describe the destructive behaviors women use toward one another. Competition among women was another theme that emerged, which many perceived as being an impediment to advocacy. One principal expressed this, saying, “Women need to really support each other instead of undercutting one another. [They need to] ‘move the cheese’ from competition to collaboration and respect.” Declared another, “Change will begin with women first, not the organization. When women become supportive of each other, the organization will reflect that support.”

Women assert that they believe in the concept of advocacy, but their actions do not support this belief.

Sixty percent (103) of the respondents reported that they have a responsibility to advocate for other women in terms of hiring, advancement, and/or acceptance into the organization, and this percentage was nearly equal among all roles. The percentages start to drop in terms of actually doing so, however; with 54% (94) indicating they are not currently proactive in

advocating for other women. Respondents appeared to deflect the question about their advocacy by hiding behind the legalities of hiring, with comments such as, "Gender cannot be considered when hiring. Isn't there a law regarding equal opportunity?" From another, "I believe in hiring the best candidate for the job—not related to gender." These responses failed to address the heart of the question, which specifically mentioned advocacy in terms of "encouraging, hiring, mentoring, and/or guiding."

Some women also seemed insulted, as if the concept of advocacy somehow took away from their own accomplishment. Example comments, such as, "I am proud to have been hired in all jobs because of my hard work and not because of my gender" were common throughout the responses. Several participants actually responded with hostile answers, including, "Please!!! I was qualified because I was a good administrator, not because I was a woman," or "It is a bit like playing the 'race' card. Gender can't be ignored, but let's not make it a bigger issue than it is."

Women believe they can only advocate for other women once they are in a position of professional security themselves.

Longevity in the school system was repeatedly invoked by respondents as important to being accepted and feeling comfortable in order to take professional risks, such as advocating for others. Seventy-nine percent (137) of the respondents expressed the need to learn the culture and/or to become a cultural insider in the system before advocating for other women. Among women who hold superintendencies, the most powerful position from which to advocate for other women, only 18% (32) indicated that they do so right from the beginning of taking the job. It is evident that women responding to the survey only felt secure in advocating for others when they were in an established, secure position themselves.

Furthermore, keeping in mind that 79% (138) indicated they would advocate for other women after they had learned the culture and/or had become a "cultural insider" themselves, and factoring in that 77% of the women had rated themselves as "cultural insiders," it is interesting that so few reported actually being active in advocating for other women. This again speaks to the disconnection between their espoused belief (that in the abstract advocacy is important) and their actions (admitting they are not advocates themselves).

Women believe if they have a representative number of female administrators in their district, gender issues in school leadership are not a concern.

Of the 58% (101) who reported that gender was no longer a concern, 42 wrote comments indicating that female representation on the administrative team was somewhat balanced; hence, no problem. For example, one wrote, "We have three very effective female administrators in this district—I do not see this as an issue," illustrating the viewpoint that numbers alone remove all other gender-related factors. Another respondent went one step further, saying, "We outnumber men . . . [gender is] no longer an issue unless you're a male!" They clearly ignored a closer examination of the district power base, whose voices are heard, and *which* roles women hold. At the other end of the continuum, among the 40% (70) who indicated that gender *is* a factor influencing advancement, there were eight whose comments demonstrated an understanding of this complexity. One of these respondents, for example, noted that the "power roles" in her district are still held by men, stating, "Five out of six district principals are women, BUT the superintendent, the assistant superintendent, and the high school principal are all men."

Overall, the responses support an earlier finding that many women believe gender-related issues are alive "elsewhere, but not here." It was not atypical to read responses such as, "Gender may be an issue other places, but it is not an issue in my district." Many women in the survey appeared to cling to the illusion that everything is basically alright because they have the numbers to support their claim, with comments like, "We have several female administrators on this administrative team." In these cases, the women deny there are deeper gender-related issues, especially within their own sphere of influence.

Analysis and implications for advocacy. Women in this study believed fully in the concept of advocacy, but in describing the actions of women toward one another, they used descriptors such as "backbiting and undercutting," far more often than "supportive and encouraging." Further, their stated belief in advocacy was not aligned to their actions. Many took themselves off the hook of "walking their talk" by only thinking of advocacy in terms of hiring, and then asserted that advocating for women would be "illegal." These comments did not reflect an understanding that advocacy can take the form of helping other women with career planning, helping them acculturate successfully into the organization, and speaking up for their advancement. Such simplistic views release them from the responsibility to

look deeper at their own motives and behaviors toward women and from taking action to alter existing stereotypes that impede women within organizations.

The common assertion that advocacy was either “not about gender” or that it somehow diminishes the accomplishments of women, indicates that many women are holding firm to a belief system that validates their own position and achievement. It was very evident that it was difficult for them to go beyond this thinking, for do so would force them to explore systems that keep women on the periphery of school organizations and in the lower ranks of administration.

Women in our study also believed if they had the “numbers” on their side, women equaling or outnumbering men on the administrative team in their district, that gender discrimination had in fact been overcome. Not only does this ignore inequalities by rank and influence, it allows women to fall into the trap of thinking that isolated success stories represent a broader truth. They are thinking locally, rather than globally, and of individual examples, rather than systems. Without an awareness of how gender issues might be playing out in their own sphere, they are unlikely to see broader patterns of discrimination, which can deny the reality of women’s struggles in a male-dominated profession and promote a false sense of equity.

Moreover, if women need to be secure in their positions prior to advocating for others, as the respondents indicated, they are surely missing opportunities to support up-and-coming women and build a stronger organization. It was clear that insecurity was keeping them from taking risks, which tends to keep individuals (and organizations) standing in the same place, unable to conceive of and explore new possibilities. The women responding to the survey were not stepping out of their comfort zone to advocate for other women, and even more noteworthy, many did not see it as important or necessary.

CONCLUSION

This study confirms and extends previous research, which suggests that gender-related factors marginalize women in school leadership. These factors fall under four broad categories we have labeled The Four A’s: *access* to administrative positions, *acculturation* within the organization, *advancement* on the hierarchical ladder, and *advocacy* for other women who may follow in their footsteps.

Interwoven across all four topics covered by this study were several troubling themes that help explain the persistence of a shortage of women in

school leadership, particularly at the highest levels. First, there is evidence that women oversimplified gender as an issue, thinking mostly in terms of the *number* of female administrators in *their* district. They often failed to consider where these women were in the hierarchy of the organization, whose voices were heard, how other women entering the district would fare within the existing culture, or how statewide and national statistics still point to inequities. There is also evidence that the respondents have limited understanding of the patriarchal system in which they operate. For example, they noted the lack of mentoring but did not consider that mentoring may be counter to changing patterns that systematically limit options for women. Only with a more sophisticated awareness of gender issues will women school leaders be able to consider that it's not about shoring up a "weakness" in women, but about fixing a male-dominated system and changing the status quo.

Additionally, it was clear that many embrace a belief that they are part of a meritocracy, where anyone who works hard enough and has the right skills will succeed—thus removing their responsibility to confront other causes for the small number of women in the highest administrative roles. Ignoring issues centered on gender can lead to denial of existing social structures. Johnson (1997) suggests that we are stuck with a patriarchal society because we cannot acknowledge its social roots and our own involvement in it. Clearly, exploring the roots of social structures can be a painful and insecure place for women to be, especially if the outcomes reveal some women have been privileged by the same system in question.

Perhaps of most concern was the repeated and emphatic insistence that barriers for women in school administration occur "somewhere else, not here." What they have not considered is that if *everyone* says it is happening everywhere but here, it is happening here, too. There certainly seems to be a blindness (and perhaps unwillingness) among many women administrators to look beyond the position they are in now and evaluate how the barriers they identified elsewhere connect to a system that affect women everywhere.

This study is based on survey data, and thus cannot possibly reflect the individual personal stories and beliefs of all female administrators across one state. Nevertheless, there are powerful implications for colleges of education, school districts, professional associations, and women themselves as they strive to create equitable opportunities for existing and upcoming school leaders. For colleges of education the study suggests that women have not been provided enough reading, discussion, and practice in viewing educational issues through a variety of lenses. Many women suggested that their *leadership* classes needed to explore gender differences more

systematically and help women be prepared to recognize and respond to gender issues they will face within the culture and politics of schooling. Due to the low number of women who had engaged in serious career planning, we would add that *teacher* preparation programs also need to infuse more feminist literature into the curriculum and add career counseling specifically focused on helping women think about their path to advancement much earlier.

For school districts, it is clear from the study that more mentoring is needed for female leaders (and perhaps for all leaders), as well as the need to mitigate the negative impact for women who come to the district from outside, or who are younger, or who hold a role that has been previously held by a man. This is not to suggest that women need to be “acculturated” blindly into a system just to fit in. But rather, they should be given the tools to succeed so they can become the kind of leaders who will work toward creating a more equitable system for everyone. School districts also need to make a concerted effort to hear the voices and ideas of all members of the administrative team, regardless of their role or gender, and to examine the culture regularly to be sure that it is safe to raise issues of equal opportunity and access for women. School districts must also confront the demands being placed on current school leaders and evaluate how these may be contributing to smaller applicant pools. Exploring ways to make these positions more family-friendly would benefit all applicants, but especially women. And certainly, for state professional associations, which were named as particularly problematic in terms of perpetuating “good ol’ boy” attitudes and behaviors, an open dialogue and examination of the norms and activities of these groups is long overdue.

Finally, the findings reveal that women need to take more responsibility for recognizing gender issues and taking proactive steps to promote equity at all levels of educational administration. Rather than feeding the stereotype that they gossip, compete, and generally do not get along, women must genuinely support their talented female colleagues and develop networks of support.

The study, therefore, underscores the need for a multi-pronged approach to correct gender inequities that are contributing to the shortage of talented school administrators. It includes: (a) exploring gender issues and patterns of discrimination as central themes within teacher preparation and educational leadership courses; (b) making conscious efforts within school districts to recognize and remove barriers that limit women’s opportunities for access, acculturation, and advancement; (c) providing genuine (and equal) support for women within professional associations; and (d) raising the level of

advocacy for women by women. It will take this kind of systematic approach to bring about change, along with a willingness among all educators to recognize that there is still a long way to go. As one respondent said, “This study, sadly, is still needed. We should certainly be past this—but we’re not.”

References

- Adams, J. P. (1999). Good principals, good schools. *Educational Leadership*, 29(1), 8-11.
- Beekley, C. (1999). Dancing in red shoes: Why women leave the superintendency. In C. C. Brunner (Ed.), *Sacred dreams: Women and the superintendency* (pp. 161-175). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Brunner, C. C. (2000). *Principles of power*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Cooper, B. S., Fusarelli, L. D., & Carella, V. A. (2000). *Career crisis in the superintendency? The results of a national survey*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 143 167)
- Chesler, P. (2002). *Woman's inhumanity to woman*. New York: Nation Books.
- Edson, S. K. (1988). *Pushing the limits*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Grogan, M. (1996). *Voices of women aspiring to the superintendency*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Grogan, M. (1999). A feminist poststructuralist account of collaboration: A model for the superintendency. In C. C. Brunner (Ed.), *Sacred dreams: Women and the superintendency* (pp. 199-216). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Grogan, M., & Brunner, C. C. (2005). Women leading systems: Latest facts and figures on women and the superintendency. *The School Administrator*, 2(62), 46-50.
- Gupton, S. L., & Slick, G. A. (1996). *Highly successful women administrators: The inside stories of how they got there*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Johnson, A. (1997). Patriarchy. In P. S. Rothenberg (Ed.) *Race, class, and gender in the United States* (pp. 129-137). New York: Worth.
- Keller, B. (1999). *Women superintendents: Few and far between*. Retrieved online March 26, 2004, from www.edweek.org/ew/ewstory/cfm?slug=11women.h19.
- Logan, J. P. (1998). *School leadership of the 90's and beyond: A window of opportunity for women educators*. Retrieved online March 25, 2004, from <http://www.advancingwomen.com/awl/summer98/LOGAN.html>.
- Maine Department of Education. (2004a). Secondary schools. Retrieved online April 5, 2004, from www.state.me.us/education/eddir/pdffiles/secschc.pdf.
- Maine Department of Education. (2004b). Superintendents of schools. Retrieved online April 5, 2004, from www.state.me.us/education/eddir/pdffiles/supalpha.pdf.
- Marshall, C., & Kasten, K. L. (1994). *The administrative career*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- NAESP. (2003). Fact sheet on the principal shortage, #1097. Retrieved online September 20, 2005, from www.naesp.org/ContentLoad.do?contentId=1097.
- Normore, A. H. (2004). Socializing school administrators to meet leadership challenges that doom all but the most heroic and talented leaders to failure. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 7(2), 107-125.
- Ortiz, F. (1982). *Career patterns in education: Women, men and minorities in public school administration*. South Hadley, MA: J. F. Bergin.
- RAND Corporation. (2003). *Research brief*, #8021. Retrieved online September 20, 2005, from www.rand.org/publications/RB/RB8021/.
- Shakeshaft, C. (1989). *Women in educational administration*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Shakeshaft, C. (1999). The struggle to create a more gender-inclusive profession. In J. Murphy & K. S. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Skrla, L. (2001). Sexism, silence and solutions: Women superintendents speak up and speak out. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 6(1), 44-75.
- Tallerico, M. (2000). *Accessing the superintendency*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Learning by Editing a Scholarly Journal*

Florence A. Hamrick

After serving two three-year terms as a member of the Editorial Board of the *Journal of College Student Development*, I was nominated by a colleague for the position of editor that was to become vacant the following year. Had this colleague not nominated me, I am confident I would not have nominated myself. Accordingly, I would have missed out on a set of significant learning experiences that have taught me a great deal thus far about journal editing, about leadership and professionalism, and about myself. It seems somewhat premature writing about these experiences and working conclusions, much less offering this essay for publication, since I am still learning after two years into my work as a journal editor. It will also be a challenge to make it through this essay without citing references to what learning “should” be or “should” entail in order to determine the extents to which I’m measuring up as a learner. But that is not the point of this essay. Educators know that reflection is an on-going process as well as a process of discovery. Additionally, we know that reflection is best engaged while learning experiences are in process and not solely retrospectively. So, I will regard this essay as a progress report on learning and hope that you will regard it this way as well.

One principal thing I have learned is that editing a journal involves taking all available opportunities (and creating additional opportunities) to bring the journal to the attention of people who may be interested in its contents and may be interested in contributing their own manuscripts for consideration. The *Journal of College Student Development* (JCSJ), the official journal of ACPA: College Student Educators International, is the leading refereed higher education journal emphasizing research on college students in higher education. JCSJ is published six times per year and reaches 10,000+ individual and institutional subscribers. Electronically, JCSJ is available through Johns Hopkins University Press’s Project Muse and is indexed within the Social Sciences Citation Index. Reports on

*A version of this essay was delivered as invited remarks to the opening plenary session at the national Women in Educational Leadership Conference held in Lincoln, Nebraska October 2005.

About the Author

Florence A. Hamrick is an associate professor in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Iowa State University. Her research interests center on women in higher education, professional ethics, predisposition to college, and the experiences of non-dominant and traditionally underrepresented groups in higher education. fhamrick@iastate.edu

empirical studies constitute the vast majority of the articles appearing in JCSD, and these studies utilize a range of approaches and methods. JCSD's manuscript acceptance rate is approximately 15%. These items are some of what you should know about JCSD.

Aside from learning to promote the journal at every opportunity, what else have I learned thus far as a journal editor? Perhaps the most important thing I have learned—or more precisely—have had reinforced, is something that educators already know full well: people are most central to the success of just about any endeavor. The individuals with whom I've been able to form partnerships are critical to the continued success of the journal. Some of the more obvious and immediate partners include the associate and managing editors, designated representatives of the publisher and, and designated representatives of the sponsoring association. Some of the less obvious partners include those with editorial board members and others who contribute to the substance and the production of the journal. In my estimation, effective educators and educational leaders recognize that the professionals with whom they work at all levels are experts in their own right, and recognizing and respecting the expertise of one's work colleagues fosters high quality processes and outcomes.

Importantly, the individuals responsible for the most important work of a journal *volunteer* their time and expertise to improve the quality of scholarship—in this case, one manuscript at a time. Despite the multiple and pressing demands on editorial board members, reviews most often contain detailed, targeted, and thoughtful feedback to authors that could not have resulted from a perfunctory manuscript scan. I have learned that editorial board members take this volunteer commitment very seriously. For my part, I have learned to listen carefully to their advice and judgments; the expertise is clearly apparent and the commitment to the journal is obvious.

Another set of expert partners are manuscript authors. A great deal of satisfaction and prestige can accompany publication of one's work, and a great deal of disappointment or frustration can accompany the rejection of one's manuscripts. I have learned from manuscript authors that their primary

motivation and reward appear to be contributing to the base of research and scholarship available to their fellow researchers and professionals. I have developed a greater appreciation and respect for the depth of scholars' commitments to advancing a knowledge base.

Although the work of publishing a journal is shared among a number of experts and contributors, I have also learned that being a journal editor is a role, like any other, that one grows into and helps to define along the way. I have thus had the opportunity to learn more about myself in these processes surrounding role "fit." For my part, I have learned that, in most cases, editorial responses or decisions need not be reached or delivered prematurely. Without indefinitely prolonging a process, when a potential decision does not feel "settled," I have learned to take time for additional deliberation or consultation. If taking this additional time is someone else's indicator of weakness or indecisiveness, I will live with that since I know that deliberation is, for me, a primary source of strength. Although it is easy to deliver welcome news about manuscripts, I have learned better how to deliver potentially disappointing news. Most decisions are ultimately the editor's to make and to communicate, and respect must be extended if partnerships are to be sustained.

I have learned that more effectively compartmentalizing my attention and segmenting my own time must be primary goals, since it turns out to be difficult for me to switch gears quickly between "editing" work to my own writing and scholarship. The different kinds of attention and focus demanded by each have simply not been compatible, particularly when the "editing" part of my brain creeps over to scrutinize early drafts of my own scholarly work and finds them woefully lacking. Although I have agreed to undertake the *role* of editor, the role must also breathe and bend to incorporate elements of my own strengths, styles, and preferences if I am to be a successful editor and accomplish this work, as well as my other work, with integrity.

Educators know that learning is a process, and that we as educators as well as learners make continual adjustments based in part on what we learn about a number of things, in any number of ways. We engage in continual processes of doing, thinking, evaluating, reflecting, feeling, and coming to working conclusions and understandings that guide us to learn still more and re-evaluate what we think we know or have gained. Most discrete learning experiences eventually come to an end. What have I learned about being an editor, about editing a journal, about leadership and professionalism, and about myself? Ask me again after my editorial term ends.

Voices of Women in the Field

External Factors Can Affect Goals

Nancy Fuller

I prided myself as being one who embraced change. I often became disgusted with my fellow teachers when they dragged their feet and resisted district initiatives. I also believed in setting goals and then managing the tasks that allows one to reach the goals. I thought it was merely a matter of purposeful planning, effort, and time that allowed one to meet goals. However, through a chain of events and life's hard knocks, I discovered that the goal premise did not necessarily work.

During the mid 1980s through 1994, middle school education was my passion. After being a middle school teacher for 13 years and reading the research regarding education for the preadolescent (10-14 year olds), I came to believe that this group of students needed a different type of education than their peers in elementary school and high school.

My second passion was curriculum. I believed that every school system needed to design a seamless set of learner objectives in each subject area with a K-12 delivery system that ensured mastery. I believed that we, as teachers, could no longer teach the topics we loved and then avoid those that were of little or no interest. I believed that 80% of what was taught should be based on curricula rather than random decisions made by each teacher. I believed that what was taught should be based on best practice and the needs of the students in the school system. It should form an abstract spiral that built on foundational skills acquired in the elementary grades, enhanced in middle level, and finally polished in the high school discipline areas.

These beliefs drove my dream—my goal. My goal was to be a middle level principal, one who assured the intellectual, physical, emotional and social needs of the preadolescent were met. Consequently, it seemed natural—logical that my goal should also drive my dissertation. Thus in 1995, I designed my proposal so that I could develop a grounded theory about opening a newly constructed middle school building. I learned a great deal about this concept from principals around the United States who had successfully accomplished this very thing.

About the Author

Nancy Fuller, a 7-12 principal, is the author of the dissertation: *Principals' Leadership Effectiveness and Implementation of Middle School Philosophy*.
nfuller@esu4.org

In 1997, I completed my doctoral work. However, I live in a small town where my husband has a law practice. I felt I had approximately a 35-40 mile radius in which to find my dream job. Unfortunately, there were only 3 middle schools within my designated boundaries. The middle school dream seemed destined to be put aside for a while.

However, in 1998, standards, locally created assessments, and accountability became the buzzwords in teacher meetings. My district's administrative team felt the district needed someone to guide and coordinate the Nebraska initiative. Thus I became the district's curriculum director.

Curriculum was my second love and the position was a part of the district administrative team. It seemed like the next best thing to the middle school principalship. During the three years I was in this position, I was able to guide our district teachers in developing K-12 curricula and supporting assessments in the core areas. Our district also used data from the assessment to create school improvement goals. It was an exciting time of change – a time of improving instruction for our students.

However, in the 2000-2001 school year, our district was faced with major economic constraints. Cuts had to be made. A curriculum director was not an accreditation necessity. Thus my position was dissolved. I was in limbo for several months. Should I go back to a middle school classroom? Should I try to teach at a neighboring state college? Should I expand my radius so I could find another position in a metropolitan area. Eventually, the middle school principal decided to retire. I applied and was given the position. Wow! How exciting! I now had the opportunity to accomplish my goal.

Unfortunately, my dream was short-lived. Economic conditions in our community continued to plummet. The school board ran a tax-override election. If passed, the board would be able to raise the tax levy above the one set by the State of Nebraska. However, the override was defeated. The board of education decided to dissolve our middle school, move the 7th and 8th graders to the high school building and the 6th graders to the elementary.

Because of this decision, my position, as well as others were cut. I was in limbo again!

At this point, tension was high in the district. I was depressed and disheartened. What had become of our district? I felt like our patrons no longer valued and supported the quality of education that we had provided in the past.

As before, I began to examine my options. Then in April, the high school principal decided to resign. The superintendent asked me to take the principalship of the 7-12 high school. He promised an assistant principal would be hired.

I was not sure I had the skills to do so. I had never taught at the high school level. I knew virtually nothing about athletics and activities. Assisting seniors with graduation requirements, and scholarships, seemed like a daunting task. However, I felt an obligation to the 7th and 8th grade students, so I accepted the position. The assistant principal and I began to design a middle school within a high school.

This is my third year in the high school principalship. It has not been easy merging two staffs with differing beliefs about instructional delivery. It has not been easy to maintain middle level programs with limited personnel and a building that was not designed to accommodate separateness for preadolescents. However, we keep tinkering with schedules, curricula, and instructional delivery methods. We are improving and we are coming together as a staff.

In regard to advice for beginning administrators, I urge you to examine and learn about education as a whole. The political landscape is rocky now. The demands from our public are great! We, as educators, will be required to change. We will need to be flexible, and perhaps more importantly, resilient. However, we can do it. It must be done for the sake of our children.

FIRST THINGS FIRST: WRITE—REWRITE

Marilyn L. Grady

The first demand of writing productivity is to create the First Draft. One unproductive diversionary activity is to attempt to perfect your writing “too early.” It is more efficient to keep writing and get the initial draft completed before editing a manuscript. Early editing can be demoralizing and derail writing momentum and flow. It is better to forge ahead and continue to add to the manuscript until the complete paper has been prepared. Only when the first draft is completed should the serious work of revision begin.

The editing process may be more difficult than writing the initial draft of the manuscript. Editing takes patience and endless attention to detail. Editing requires self-critique! Editing requires a different approach than the creative flow of writing. Editing may not provide the same sense of satisfaction, productivity, and accomplishment one has when one is in the generative, free writing phase.

Editing, however, may be more important than the creative phase of writing. A manuscript that is not carefully edited may never “appear in print.” It is only through careful editing that an author’s ideas are revealed to the reader.

Editing demands attention to the many aspects of a manuscript. For instance, content and ideas may need to be changed. The sequence of the manuscript may require revision. Sentences may need to be revised. Spelling and punctuation may need attention.

Following are some of the considerations in the editing process. First, examine the introduction to make sure it sets the tone for the manuscript and draws the writer into the subject. It is important to make sure that the purpose of the manuscript is presented early in the text. Readers make the decision “to read, or not to read” based on this information.

Second, determine if the sequence of the paragraphs and content is appropriate. Third, read the text and make sure that each aspect is presented thoroughly yet concisely. Make sure that transitions are provided that ease the reader from one topic to the next topic. Fourth, examine the conclusions to assure that they summarize the main ideas of the manuscript and point to the implications of the report. Fifth, check the spelling, punctuation, and adherence to the dictates of the appropriate style manual.

Read the manuscript aloud! This will allow you to identify errors in grammar as well as awkward phrasing. Your ear is a fine adjunct to your eye in the editing process. The time spent editing your manuscript is possibly more important than the time spent writing the initial draft, since the editing reveals the hidden jewel in the rough manuscript.