

INFORMATION TO USERS

The most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

U·M·I

University Microfilms International
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600



Order Number 9115723

**A profile analysis of women in central office positions in North
Carolina public schools (1989)**

Lackey-Laumann, Josiane Thérèse, Ed.D.

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1990

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106



NOTE TO USERS

**THE ORIGINAL DOCUMENT RECEIVED BY U.M.I. CONTAINED PAGES
WITH SLANTED PRINT. PAGES WERE FILMED AS RECEIVED.**

THIS REPRODUCTION IS THE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.



A PROFILE ANALYSIS OF WOMEN IN CENTRAL OFFICE POSITIONS
IN NORTH CAROLINA PUBLIC SCHOOLS (1989)


by

Josiane Lackey-Laumann

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Greensboro
1990

Approved by


Dissertation Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation
Adviser Kenneth A. Krueger

Committee Members Cliff Powell
Joseph E. Bryson
Mary Ellis Nelson

3-26-90
Date of Acceptance by Committee

3/26/90
Date of Final Oral Examination

LACKEY-LAUMANN, JOSIANE, Ed.D. A Profile Analysis of Women in Central Office Positions in North Carolina Public Schools, 1989. (1989) Directed by Dr. Harold R. Snyder. 126 pp.

The purpose of this study was to determine the status, personal and professional background, future plans, and career strategies of the women who were employed in the central administrative offices of North Carolina public schools. Questionnaires were mailed to 478 women who were listed in the Education Directory, 1988-89. A total of 335 usable responses were returned and tabulated.

Positions held by the women respondents included those of superintendents, assistant and associate superintendents, directors of instruction, supervisors, directors of special projects, and coordinators with various titles. A majority of the women (72.9%) had been employed in their present position for 5 years or less.

Approximately 70% of the women were over 40 years of age; most of the women (73.4%) were married. A majority of the respondents (78.1%) had at least one child. The women received salaries ranging from \$20,000 to more than \$50,000. The women indicated that they assumed responsibilities primarily in the areas of personnel evaluation, staff development, materials/equipment, and financial reports.

Almost two-thirds of the women (73%) had earned a master's degree. Twenty-six (7.7%) of the women held two master's degrees. Fifty-two (15.5%) of the women had an educational specialist degree, and 41 (12%) held an earned doctorate.

Almost one-half of the women considered their position terminal. Some women (30%) had desires for top level positions such as superintendent or assistant/associate superintendent. Approximately one-third of the women had definite plans for formal study. Another third of the women indicated that formal study was a possibility, and the remaining third had no plans to continue formal study.

The leading factors for advancement in the field of educational administration reported by the women were equal consideration with men, advanced training, persistence in applying, networking, mentors, female attitudes, and willingness of school system to hire women.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express gratitude to the many individuals who have contributed to making possible my entire doctoral program. The completion of this work and my program of studies would not have been possible without the wisdom, guidance, and support of my adviser and mentor, Dr. Harold R. Snyder. With his advice each crisis passed, and I continued to achieve goals.

In addition, appreciation is extended to committee members, Dr. Dale Brubaker, Dr. Joseph Bryson, and Dr. Mary Ellis Gibson, for their interest, advice, support, and friendship throughout this study and my program.

I also wish to acknowledge the respondents of my survey who gave freely of their time and their energy. In a critical sense they made this dissertation possible, and I am grateful.

Special thanks are extended to Ibbby Hunt, whose expertise concerning proper form and arrangement "created" this work and to Dr. Judith Penny for her statistical assistance.

To my daughter, Janeth Taylor Laumann, I owe appreciation for her understanding, support, and confidence in my quest to achieve. To my friend, Douglas Hilton Bray, I am grateful for his patience and encouragement. To my friends, Susan and Ray Smith, I shall always remember their kindness

and support. To my colleague, Terry Mitchell, I am thankful for his advice and assistance in the academic world.

Finally, my heartfelt thanks go to my parents, Carl and Gilberte Lackey. Before it became fashionable, they taught me to strive for success, and any achievement that I have found is grounded in their unconditional love. Leadership has no gender in their thoughts.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL PAGE.	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Statement of the Problem.	6
Questions To Be Answered.	7
Significance of the Study	8
Definition of Terms	9
Methodology	13
Limitations	14
Organization of the Study	15
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	16
Historical Perspective.	16
Working Women	20
Gender-Role Socialization	26
Internal Barriers	29
Identity Development.	29
Family and Career Role Conflict	30
Mobility.	31
Aspirations	32
External Barriers	34
Personnel Selection	34
Lack of Networks.	35
Power	37
Lack of Mentors	37
Few Women in Educational Policy Positions	38
Profiles of Administrators.	39
Rights and limitations Under the Law.	40
Summary	43
III. METHODOLOGY.	45
Development of the Instrument	46
Validation of the Instrument.	47
Preparation of the Cover Letter	47
Sample Selection.	47
Data Analysis	49
Summary	50

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
IV. PRESENTATION OF THE DATA	51
Personal Data of Women in Central Office	
Positions	51
Positions Held by Women	51
Years in Present Position	52
Distribution of Ages	55
Marital Status	55
Number of Children	55
Salaries	55
Type of District Where Employed	58
Present Positions of the Women	58
Position Responsibilities	58
Factors Influential for Seeking Present Position	63
Plans to Enter Administration	63
Planning to Acquire Position	65
Achievement of Position	65
Qualifications Required for Position	65
Predecessor in Position	67
Positions Now Held by Predecessors	67
Immediate Superior	67
Experience and Training	70
Age When Assumed First Position	70
Positions Held prior to Present Position	70
Degrees Earned and Major Fields of Study	73
Factors Prohibiting Completion of Grad- uate program	73
Difficulty in Obtaining Administrative Position	77
Factors Attributed to Difficulty in Obtaining Position	77
Plans for the Future	79
Plans for Further formal Study	79
Future Employment Plans	79
Preference for Next Position	79
Involving Women's Professional Advance- ment in Administration	82
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	84
Summary	84
Conclusions	93
Recommendations for Future Action	96
Recommendations for Future Research	98

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

	Page
BIBLIOGRAPHY	100
APPENDIX A STATUS STUDY OF FEMALE NORTH CAROLINA ADMINISTRATORS	111
APPENDIX B LETTER TO ADMINISTRATORS	117
APPENDIX C TABLE OF RANDOM NUMBERS	119
APPENDIX D LISTING OF NORTH CAROLINA SCHOOL UNITS USED FOR RANDOM SAMPLE	123

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Distribution of Positions of Women	53
2 Years in Present Position	53
3 Relationship Between Years in Position and Titles.	54
4 Age of Subject	56
5 Present Marital Status	56
6 Number of Children Subject Has	57
7 Present Yearly Salary	59
8 Distribution of Salaries by Position Held . . .	60
9 Type School District Where Employed and Pupil Population of School District	61
10 Responsibilities of Position	62
11 Factors Influencing Desire to Seek Present Position	64
12 Plans to Enter Administration	64
13 Career Plan for Achieving Position.	66
14 How Present Position Was Obtained	66
15 Qualifications Required to Hold Present Position	68
16 Person Women Succeeded in Position	68
17 Position Predecessor Now Holds.	69
18 Position and Sex of Immediate Superiors of the Women	71
19 Age When Assumed First Supervisory/Administra- tive Appointment	71

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

	Page
Table	
20 Positions Held Prior to Present Position . . .	72
21 Degrees Earned With Major Field of Study . . .	74
22 Factors Prohibiting Completion of Graduate Program	76
23 Difficulty in Obtaining Administrative Positions.	78
24 Factors Attributed to Difficulty in Obtaining Position	78
25 Plans for Further Formal Study	80
26 Plans for Further Study and Age of the Women .	80
27 Plans for Future Employment	81
28 Preference for Next Position	83
29 Improving Women's Professional Advancement in Administration	83

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Educational institutions traditionally have not been the forerunners of social change; schools are the mirror of the society they serve, and their purpose is to socialize the young into the prevailing adult culture. Public school people, by and large, are in the mainstream of American society and do not hold radical political or social ideologies. Changes in education emanate from movements in the larger society.

Educational administration has developed as a profession largely occupied by men rather than women, even though the number of women in teaching exceeds the number of men. Historically, schools were structured along the male endeavors of administering and the female services of instructing. The history of women's education in the United States was centered on educating females for their domestic role in society (Stockard, 1980). Women were allowed to move into previously male roles during martial conflicts--Civil War, World War I, and World War II (Graham, 1971; Smith, 1982). During the 1950's and 1960's fewer women occupied administrative positions in the schools. The new operation concept for the school became comparable to that of a modern corporation. Women with their limited knowledge of big business and power

were handicapped in securing administrative positions. Administrators, as differentiated from teachers, were seen as males with masculine concerns for financing, organization, and leadership, as opposed to feminine concerns for nurturing, instructing, and imparting values. Educational administration soon became defined as a profession for men who not only admired industrialists and businessmen, but resembled them as well (Gross & Task, 1976).

Change in American lifestyles during the 1960's and the 1970's was strongly evidenced by, among other events, the dramatic increase in women's entrance into the paid work force. This labor modification, in turn, created its own dynamic impact on most, if not all, of the sustaining elements of the nation's society. Because the United States Department of Labor and other agencies charged with planning had repeatedly underestimated female participation in the paid work force, the unanticipated large number of women moving onto payroll sheets forced government officials to look more critically at the needs of this group whose strength lies in its growing numbers. In an effort to solve some of the unique causes and effects that had surfaced from this change process, Congress mandated in the Educational Amendments of 1976 that recipients of federal vocational education monies must take actions to overcome sex bias, sex stereotyping, and sex discrimination in such programs which prepare

men and women for the world of work. This new directive formulated a substantial basis for an intense examination of the delivery system for elements that have perpetuated occupational gender segregation, wage earning inequities, and other facets of sex discrimination permeating occupations (U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1987).

In 1972-73 women represented about 63% of the total number of professionals in education. Men represented 99% of the superintendents, 98% of high school principals, 97% of junior high school principals, and 80% of the elementary school principals (Schmuck, 1980).

The underrepresentation of women in educational administration and corporate America promoted a decade of affirmative action programs, Title IX, landmark judicial decisions regarding discrimination, and government funding to equalize opportunities for women. Clearly the United States Congress and the federal and state courts took the position that discrimination on the basis of sex was in violation of the Constitution's XIVth Amendment. Title IX specifically prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in the recruitment and hiring of employees. Title IX does not, however, require any affirmative action on the part of the educational institution to rectify disproportionate male/female distribution of staff, faculty, and students (Levandowski, 1977).

With the above forces at work, a trend toward the approximation of equal representation by women in the

administration of the public schools should be expected. However, statistics indicate the opposite. A full 96% of superintendents and 76% of principals in public schools were men in 1988. This contrasts with 69% of female teachers in the public schools employed in 1988 (Feistritzter, 1988).

Many reasons have been given for the underrepresentation of women in leadership positions. Many of the reasons are factual and some have been proven mythical.

Internal factors such as attitudinal barriers limit women's progress in educational administration. Primary among these barriers are self-concept and perceptions of one's ability as well as aspiration levels.

Sex-role socialization of females is quite different from that of males. At an early age boys are socialized to be aggressive, competitive, and achievement-oriented. Girls are often socialized to be passive, noncompetitive, and unwilling to seek promotions. These qualities keep women from seeking positions of leadership. This type of socialization helps men in the preservation of a status quo through their continued advancement up the organizational ladder (Shakeshaft, 1983).

Women have different experiences than do men. Particularly germane to work-related experience within the field of education, women tend to have more instructional experience than men. Their frequent failures in seeking advancement in the administrative job market positions often limit

their willingness to continue to seek these positions (Lovelady-Dawson, 1980). Lovelady-Dawson identified factors suggesting that those in power recruited, placed, and promoted favored individuals most like themselves.

Lack of formal training has been cited as a reason for women's lack of success in entering administration. Women also confront the problem of financial resources needed to pursue graduate work (Shakeshaft, 1984).

Many external barriers exist for women. The lack of opportunity to see other women in a variety of administrative positions, to hear how these women describe their lives, and to compare themselves with women just one step higher up the hierarchy has been cited as a reason why women have not moved into administrative positions in larger numbers (Schmuck, 1976). Lack of sponsorship or mentors has been listed a barrier to women's achievement in administration. A sponsor or mentor advises, supports, and helps the individual (Shakeshaft, 1984). Related to sponsorship is the need to have access to a network that provides one with information on job opening and administrative strategies as well as with visibility and that functions as a support group. Women have traditionally been excluded from these networks and thus have not heard about administrative positions, have not been known by others, and have had few people to approach for counsel (Schmuck, 1986).

Internal barriers can be overcome by individual change, while external barriers require social and institutional change. The underrepresentation of females in administrative positions is a major concern for public education. The 1990's will be a challenging decade for education and business. For the first time in history, women are beginning to reach a critical mass within the business community. According to futurists John Naisbett and Patricia Aburdene (1990), the balance of power is rapidly shifting in favor of women.

In the first decades of the third millennium we and our children will look back at the later half of the 20th century and remark on how quaint were the days when women were excluded from the top echelons of business and political leadership, much as we today recall when women could not vote. How naive were the men and women of the 1980's, we will say, those people who believed in something called a 'glass ceiling' and thought it would forever exclude women from the top. (Naisbitt & Aberdene, 1990, p. 240)

Barriers that inhibit women from aspiring to leadership positions in education must be identified and eliminated if the decade of the 90's is to offer more opportunity for women in administrative careers in education than did the decade of the 80's.

Statement of the Problem

In a field almost exclusively dominated by men, women who successfully occupy leadership positions can provide a rich source of information. There is a need for updated research on female administrators in North Carolina public

schools, focusing on personal background, educational and professional qualifications, future plans, and identified factors needed for acquiring an administrative position. This study is a replication of A Profile Analysis of Women in Central Office Positions in North Carolina Public Schools, 1979, by Elaine Stiller.

Desired outcomes of this research effort are (a) a better understanding of the status of female administrators in current educational systems, (b) identification of factors which promote success in acquiring a leadership position, and (c) recommendations for women seeking an administrative position. The findings should prove useful to women aspiring to become administrators in the 90's.

Questions To Be Answered

Several key questions which need to be answered are the following:

1. What are the administrative positions held by women in the public schools?
2. How many years have these women held a position or positions in administration?
3. What are the duties and responsibilities of the women in administrative positions?
4. What types of problems have women encountered in acquiring administrative positions?
5. What are the reasons stated by women for being hired or promoted?

6. What is the personal background of women in administrative positions?

7. What is the professional background and training of women in administrative positions?

8. What are the future plans of the women currently in administrative positions?

9. What strategies would improve the professional advancement of women in education?

Significance of the Study

More women than men are employed in the profession of education in the United States. Teaching has been and continues to be primarily a women's profession. In 1988 69% of teachers in the public schools were women. In contrast, 96% of superintendents and 76% of principals were men (Feistritzer, 1988, p. 13).

In addition to this sharp segregation in the educational work force, the positions men hold are more highly paid, are more prestigious, and provide more authority over other adults than do the positions women hold. Although school districts no longer pay men educators more than women educators simply because they are men, the administrative positions do have much higher salaries than the teaching positions. Thus, the average salaries of men in education are higher than those of women (U.S. Dept. of Labor, Women's Bureau, Fact Sheet, p. 1).

The abilities of women as compared to men in administration have been the basis for many studies. Most of the research is centered around the principalship at elementary and middle school levels. Conclusions from these studies indicated there is little difference related to sex roles among the characteristics studied.

Over one million boys and girls are educated in the schools of North Carolina. This task requires the leadership of individuals in top level decision-making positions. There is a need to know whether women are being given opportunities to participate in these decisions; whether women are in positions of responsibility in the organizational structure of education in the public schools of North Carolina; whether women faced obstacles reaching their position; whether women's experiences and education helped them obtain their present position; and whether women's expectations in the future will influence change in the 1990's. These were questions posed by this study to the women who occupy administrative positions in the central office of the public schools of North Carolina.

Definition of Terms

Administrative Officer--a member of an educational staff with responsibilities in the direction, control or management of a school or schools in an educational system.

Administrative Position--a position involving performance of major duties in organizing, managing, or supervising

duties of other employees and calling for the carrying of certain responsibilities in the direction, control, or management of an educational or other institution.

Administrative Unit--that geographic unit comprising all the area under a single system of school administration.

Advisory Duties--duties consisting of recommendation based on knowledge or experience.

Career Path--the training and prior job assignments of school staff who eventually become principals or higher level administrators.

Central Office (administration)--principal educational authority having jurisdiction over a school system or major division thereof.

Educational Administration--direction, control, and management of all matters pertaining to school affairs.

Flextime--flexible work schedule in which workers can within a prescribed band of time in the morning and afternoon start and finish work at their discretion as long as they complete the total number of hours required for a given period, usually a month.

Leadership--ability to influence, persuade, get ideas accepted, to guide willing followers, and to create a positive team climate (Brubaker, 19).

Mentor--wise counselor, sponsor who advises, teaches, coaches, and shares information to learn the complexities of management.

Mentoring--the practice of sharing information, counseling, advising, and coaching a new or less experienced employee to understand the complexities of management.

Networking--using personal contacts to achieve a goal or objective; trade-offs to share information, business contacts, and support.

Position Power--legitimate power; ability to execute the assigned authority inherent in the job description, title, and specifications.

Power--to have impact, influence, effect change, make things happen, choose to change. Ability to achieve objectives and get results.

Public School--a school with either elementary or secondary grades, organized under a school district of a state, supported by tax revenues, administered by public officials, and opened to all.

Referent Power--power through personality or influence.

Role--characteristic behavior expected of a person or persons who occupy a position in a group.

School Administration--a social process in the field of education concerned with identifying, maintaining, stimulating, controlling, and unifying formally and informally organized human and material energies within an integrated school system designed to accomplish predetermined educational objectives.

School District--the area covered by a school system or local education authority, normally run by a board of education or school board.

School System--the schools and supporting services operated by the board of education, by a specified administrative unit, or by another organization which operated one or more schools.

Setting--a sustained cooperation of created relationships of persons (Sarason, 1971) engaged in achieving certain goals, specifically the learning of all participants (Brubaker, 1982).

Staff Officer--an educational administrator, frequently a specialist in his or her field, who serves as an advisor and produces needed information as a basis for effective judgment or action, but is not responsible for making decisions.

Stereotypes--beliefs about a group's predictable characteristics that allow us to categorize the group and generalize about its behavior without looking at the individuals as individuals.

Superintendent's Immediate Team--the administrative officers who report to and are directly responsible to the superintendent.

Supervision--provision of assistance of an advisory and consultative nature to line officers.

Terminal--a level of employment beyond which individuals do not normally expect to go.

Methodology

1. A review of the literature was made to determine previous studies in administrative positions.
2. A list of women to be surveyed in the study was compiled from the Education Directory of North Carolina, 1988-89.
3. A survey instrument was designed, revised, and refined with the assistance of Dr. Rita O'Sullivan, Director of the Center for Educational Research at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.
4. The questionnaire was piloted by submission of the instrument for criticism of construction, design, and content to 14 women in the Greensboro Public School System. Twelve responses, or 85%, were returned.
5. The study was endorsed by the North Carolina Association of Educators, Division of Principals and Administrators.
6. A copy of the questionnaire, a letter of transmittal, and a return enveloped were mailed to a random sample of women in administrative or staff positions attached to the central office who report directly to the superintendent or a member of the superintendent's immediate team. The positions included superintendents, associate/assistant superintendents, coordinators, supervisors, directors, and all other persons in positions related to functioning of the schools.

7. Nominal data were collected. Frequency distributions and percentages were calculated for each question. Cross table frequency distributions were calculated for the following variables: salary, age, number of years position held, and plans for the future. The statistical package, SAS, calculated all data.

Limitations

1. This study was a random sample limited to the 139 administrative units within the State of North Carolina in 1989.
2. Those sampled were women in administrative or staff positions attached to the central office who report directly to the superintendent or a member of the superintendent's immediate team. The positions included superintendents, associate/assistant superintendents, coordinators, supervisors, directors, and all other persons in positions related to functioning of the schools. Such positions as attendance officers, nurses, home-school coordinators, itinerant teachers, and remedial teachers were excluded.
3. Identification of minorities was excluded.
4. The study was limited by any bias which may exist between women who returned the questionnaire and those women who did not return the questionnaire.

Organization of the Study

The study was organized as follows:

Chapter I contains the introduction, statement of the problem, questions to be answered, significance of the study, definition of terms, methodology, limitations, and organization of the study.

Chapter II examines the literature relevant to the study.

Chapter III includes a narrative discussion of the research methodology used in this study. This chapter describes the development of the survey instrument, field-testing procedures, sample selection, data collection, and analysis procedures. The relationship of the North Carolina administrator to administrators nationwide is explored.

Chapter IV presents an analysis and an interpretation of the data which are juxtaposed on national studies for comparison and information.

Chapter V contains the summary, conclusions, and recommendations, as well as the answers to the questions that were proposed in the first chapter.

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Today, the problems of women in public school leadership may seem a little passé. Surely these problems are dwarfed by other concerns such as SAT scores, Senate Bill 2, or drugs in the schools. Surely the problems of equity were solved long ago.

Yet such a judgment is not only superficial but inaccurate. The extent to which women participate in administering the schools is one measure of education's real commitment to the ideal of equal opportunity for all Americans, an ideal that is far from being realized.

It is easy to be lulled into the false assumption that women in educational leadership now roughly reflect their representation in the general population. Yet as the review of literature will show, this is not the case.

This chapter is a review of the articles, books, and reports that have been written about the role of women in society and in the administration of the public schools.

Historical Perspective

The history of women in educational administration is interwoven with the history of women in teaching. Although teaching has been viewed in the twentieth century as a female

profession, teachers have not always been women. Until the late 18th century, all teachers were men (Shakeshaft, 1987).

The history of women's education in the United States is a history of distinctions made "on the basis of irrelevant differences" (Stockard, 1980, p. 89). Women were denied equality of consideration over the years; those who denied them that equality felt no obligation to justify what they did. This was because of the manner that official notions of relevance were imposed and internalized. Righteously and with perfect self-assurance, those in power did what they could to perpetuate the existence of a separate and subordinate female sphere. Great apostles of enlightenment like Dr. Benjamin Rush called for "a peculiar and suitable education of our ladies" (Stockard, 1980, p. 90). The concepts of liberty and equality gave women a special responsibility; they were appointed to instruct "their sons in the principles of liberty" (Stockard, 1980, p. 90). Benjamin Rush's arguments for female education were convincing not only because they were functional, but because they did not challenge the sanctity of the family or the superiority of males. The focus was on education as being useful for women's domestic role (Colt, 1977). Educators of the time were often more concerned with defining the limits of social roles for women than with exploring the potential for learning.

Between 1820 and 1830, growth in industry and business provided more lucrative job opportunities for male teachers.

During this time women entered teaching. From the beginning, women teachers were treated less favorably than were men teachers. In common schools, men were the masters or principals, whereas women were the assistant teachers; in high schools, males were called "Professor" and females were addressed as "Miss" (Clifford, 1982, p. 237).

In the early days of public schooling in the United States, the teacher did everything, including administration. As education became more complex and as bureaucritization was imposed upon schools, the functions of administrator and teacher became more distinct (Shakeshaft, 1987). Between 1830 and 1900, only a few women held administrative positions. During the years between 1900 and 1930, women occupied principalships and county and state superintendencies (Shakeshaft, 1987).

The depression years of the 1930's were not conducive to the advancement of women. The limited number of available jobs revived certain historical attitudes whereby the employment of men took precedence over the employment of women. This attitude was based on the premise that the man was head of the household and the main supporter of the family (McMurry, 1940).

The number of female administrators increased during World War II. At the conclusion of World War II, employment patterns returned to prewar conditions. Many men returning from the war used the G.I. Bill for education. The surplus

of educated males were recruited for teaching and administering (Shakeshaft, 1987).

Consolidation of white and black schools in the late 1950's and 1960's was also a factor in the decline of female administrators. The school was the setting for changes-- racial issues, Soviet space dominance, male role models. Schools needed discipline and school boards decided that only male teachers and administrators could provide order in the school. Many males entered teaching and administration to avoid the draft during the Vietnam War (Shakeshaft, 1987).

The 1970's drew attention to the underrepresentation of women in administrative positions in schools. It was the era of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, Women's Educational Equity Act, Vocational Education Act, and Affirmative Action. The number of women principals declined from 55% in 1928 to 19.6% in 1972. The number of female superintendents declined from 2.1% in 1950 to 0.1% in 1972 (Shakeshaft, 1987, p. 20).

The 1980's gave women a false sense of security about the achievements of the 1970's. Moreover, the difficulties encountered in trying to penetrate a male-dominated society have significantly reduced the expectations of many women. The Reagan administration intentionally destroyed the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, an organization long effective in the fight for better conditions for America's women and minorities. An increasingly conservative Supreme Court

ruled in 1984 that an entire college is not subject to civil rights laws protecting women, even if one of its programs receives major federal aid. Women did penetrate into some entry positions in organizations, but it was much harder for them to get into the top positions, the "inner sanctum" (Benokraitis & Feagin, 1986, p. 15).

Virginia Woolf wrote that "women have served all these centuries as looking glasses possessing the magic and delicious power of reflecting the figure of man at twice its natural size" (1950, p. 92). Women have challenged and are challenging their looking glass function in this society, but they are a long way from shattering the glass.

Working Women

In 1988 women comprised 45% of the nation's labor force. Nearly 75% of these women were employed in clerical, sales, service, factory, or plant jobs. More than a third of all women workers held clerical positions, which paid an average of less than \$15,000 a year. Only 16% of the women were classified as professional, and most of them were elementary and secondary school teachers, nurses, health technicians, or librarians. Of the 54.7 million women in the work force in 1988, only 6.4% were managers (U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Current Population Survey, 1988 annual averages, p. 18).

With 51% of all married women now working, wives who once stayed home may become as unusual as women who worked

in offices and factories once were. In 1988, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, 58% of women with school-age children were working; 41% of women with children too young to attend school also were employed (Bureau of Labor Statistics). The rapid increase in the number of working wives can be traced in part to the fading of the social stigma attached to working mothers. Today, a career is as much a status symbol for a wife as it is for a husband. But an equally compelling factor encouraging wives to work is financial need. Two-thirds of all women in the labor force in March 1983 were either single (25%), widowed (5%), divorced (11%), or separated (4%), or had husbands with earnings of less than \$15,000 (21%). Also, the rising cost of living has forced many married women to enter the job market, not simply to earn money for family necessities, but to afford the luxury items middle-class Americans have come to expect (Foster, 1984).

Few transformations in the last generation have equalled that of the American woman. As a result of this transformation, the entire demographic, social, and economic patterns of American society have been altered. A large percentage of women have either replaced childbearing with careers or decided that one does not necessarily exclude the other. An increase in the divorce rate, a decrease in the birth rate, and delayed marriages have drastically changed the make-up of the American household. The percentage of

households composed of a husband-wife couple dropped from 78% to 61% in 1980 compared to 1970. In 1988, the Census Bureau listed 11,060,000 households maintained by women (Census Bureau, 1988).

Since 1982, the first woman has been appointed to the U.S. Supreme Court, the first American woman astronaut has circled the earth, and a woman was a candidate for Vice-President. In the decade between 1972 and 1982, the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics findings indicate that women made major gains in such traditionally male-dominated occupations as medicine and law. Quite often the primary criterion for positions in the areas of medicine and law is a professional degree, and more and more women graduating from professional schools are meeting this requirement (Foster, 1984). However, the total picture is less encouraging. Still, only 8 of the 75 active astronaut positions at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) are held by women. Of the 677 federal judges, only 52 are women; and of the 535 members of both houses of Congress, only 24 are female (Fox & Hesse-Biber, 1984). The position of professional women becomes more vivid when their particular location and specialization are examined. In medicine, for example, women are concentrated in pediatrics, psychiatry, public health, and other relatively low-status specialties, such as anesthesiology and pathology. Women are absent from the most prestigious and remunerative subfields--cardiovascular medicine, gastroenterology, and

especially surgery. Women's position in law resembles their status within medicine. Female attorneys are concentrated in the low-status and less lucrative and powerful fields-- trusts, estates, and domestic relations. These are the more invisible specialties, which are practiced in the background and in the back rooms, away from contact with powerful clients and institutions. Furthermore, because these specialties are less profitable and are considered less important, it is difficult for the women within them to gain distinction or to advance by contributing substantially to the firm's profits and prestige (Fox & Hesse-Biber, 1984).

Likewise in academia, the status of women is much below men's. Academic women are located disproportionately in 4-year colleges and state universities with heavy teaching loads and undergraduate enrollments uncondusive to the research and publication that lead to professional eminence and recognition. Academic women also hold lower-ranking positions than do men. Across all colleges and universities, as the rank decreases, the proportion of women increases: Women represent only about 10% of the full professors, but nearly 30% of the assistant professors, and in the lowest ranks--instructor and lecturer positions--women represent almost 50% of the faculty (Fox & Hesse-Biber, 1984).

Working women are greatly disadvantaged in their salaries. Crawling toward a close at about a penny a year for

the past 10 years, the gap between women's and men's earnings still is 34 cents per dollar (Chan, 1990).

About half the salary gap is due to discrimination in wage setting. The Equal Pay Act in 1963 made it illegal to pay a woman less than a man for the same job. The problem is that men and women tend to do different jobs, and jobs dominated by men tend to pay more than jobs dominated by women. Equal pay for the same work is ineffective when equal work, in practice, means the same work, and most women are not doing the same work as men (Chan, 1990).

The comparable worth theory is the contention that male-dominated jobs pay more than female-dominated jobs because the pay for female jobs is not proportional to the "intrinsic value" or worth of what women do. The goal of pay equity is accomplished by raising the wages of predominantly female jobs in a workplace to match the wages of similarly valued male jobs. The undervaluation of female jobs is immediately evident from a group of cases regularly cited in the comparable worth literature, such as the considerably higher wages paid to male tree surgeons in contrast to the wages paid to librarians and nurses. The National Organization of Office Workers cited a bank offering \$745-1090 per month for general clerks, who must analyze invoices and give "good telephone etiquette," and who are usually female, while offering \$1,030-1,100 per month for shipping clerks, who need only write legibly and be able to "lift equipment in excess of

100 lbs." but who are usually male. It is thought obvious that the ability to talk on the telephone entitles one to at least as much money as a strong back (Levin, 1988, p. 132).

Comparable worth presents a coordination problem of the sort which tends to get solved by government. In 1983 figures, there were 49 million full-time working men, whose median income was \$20,683, and 31 million full-time working women, whose median income was \$12,172. The raw gap to be closed was about \$8,500 per woman (Levin, 1988).

Women have made great strides in obtaining jobs that require postsecondary education and/or skills training. As recently as 1986, their share of managerial and professional specialty jobs reached 43% compared to only 19% in 1972 (U.S. Dept. of Labor, January, 1988). More women have their own small businesses. A report from IRS showed that there are 2.8 million companies owned by women in the United States, and another report showed that 3.5 million women were self-employed (Morrison, White, & Van Velsor, 1987).

It is still rare to find women at the top of America's largest corporations. In the Fortune 500 companies, only 1.7% of the corporate officers are women. Additional figures compiled for a 1986 special report by the Wall Street Journal staff lists the composition of executives in some leading companies in America:

At IBM, the top 6,700 managers include just 500 women.
At AT&T, only 26 of the top 880 executives are women.
At GE, only 90 of approximately 4,000 managers eligible for bonuses were women. (p. 7D)

At Chemical Bank, only about 15 percent of the more than 1,000 vice presidents are women.

At the Bank of America, only 20 percent of the top 3,000 executives are women, even though women comprise 64 percent of the company's officials and managers.

Despite increasing numbers of women in business, women are definitely underrepresented in the most powerful management positions (Morrison et al., 1987).

Gender-Role Socialization

The process of building self-image goes this way: A new reflection, a new experience, or a bit of new growth leads to a new success or failure, which in turn leads to a new or revised statement about the self. In this fashion, each person's self-concept usually evolves throughout his/her lifetime. (Briggs, 1977, p. 16)

The relationship between women's work status and women's self-attitudes is circular and extremely complex. Women can not understand themselves and their attitudes toward themselves unless they understand the dynamics of their individual upbringing and their experience with culture and society.

Parental gender-role socialization has a more global impact than does the communication of a particular set of "gender-appropriate" behaviors (Peretti & Sydney, 1985, p. 215). Girls and boys are taught by their parents to take different approaches to problem-solving, to challenge, and to life in general. Jeanne Block (1984) argued that boys are socialized to "develop a premise system that presumes or anticipates mastery, efficacy, and instrumental competence"

(p. 209). The socialization practices directed at girls tend toward "fostering proximity, discouraging independent problem solving by premature or excessive intervention, restricting exploration, and discouraging active play" (Freeman, 1989, p. 198).

Block's conclusions are supported by a wealth of research besides her own. For example, one study showed that parents used different strategies when working on jigsaw-puzzle and memory tasks with their 6-year-old daughters and sons. They were more likely to try to teach general problem-solving strategies to their sons and to make specific solution suggestions to their daughters. With a daughter, parents were more likely to work with the child cooperatively and to provide her with information about whether her performance was correct. With a son, parents were more likely to be physically uninvolved in the task but to direct and order the son's performance and to give him praise (such as "You did well") or negative responses (such as "Stop acting silly" (Frankel & Rollins, 1983, p. 702).

The process by which children learned through observation of their parents' behavior is called role modeling (Sanford & Donovan, 1984). One parent was the primary role model. Hennig and Jardim (authors of The Managerial Woman) found that the women executives they studied had learned from their fathers the attitudes that contributed to their success in male-dominated corporations.

Teachers' behavior adds to gender-role socialization pressure as soon as children enter the educational system. Part of teacher influence occurs through the teacher's choice of textbooks that depict gender in traditional ways and present females as invisible or incompetent (Freeman, 1989). The field of education that women have been most excluded from is history. Students learn about Renaissance Man, Man in the Middle Ages, Man in the West, etc., but nothing about women in these times. Women are not important enough to be mentioned in history books. When a female reads history, she is instantly invalidated. She finds images of male warriors, conquerors, explorers, inventors. The standard historical record gives her a Joan of Arc (burned at the stake), a Betsy Ross (seamstress), a Carrie Nation (moralistic battle-ax), a Florence Nightingale (super nurse), and a few queens (all of whom obtained the throne because of a lack of male heirs). Females are taught that Man the Hunter invented the first tools, mastered fire, developed language, and made conceptual contributions that enabled the human race to progress through time. The fact is that earliest human ancestors were vegetarians, and it was Woman the Gatherer who provided the bulk of the nourishment that enabled the species to survive. Moreover, anthropological evidence suggests that it was woman, not man, who played the most active role in the creation of early human

culture. It was probably she, not he, who invented the first tools (possibly child- and food-carrying slings fashioned out of long grasses), who mastered fire, who developed such skills as pottery, weaving, and building, and who also played the primary role in the development of language, mathematics, and the sciences of horticulture and agriculture (Sanford & Donovan, 1984). Most of the history books in the educational system do not include this information.

Internal Barriers

Identity Development

Identity development has been the focus for many studies in interpreting women's development. Carol Gilligan agreed with Nancy Chodorow's studies that masculinity is defined through separation, while femininity is defined through attachment. Females view self in relation to others. Her study raises questions about the validity of dichotomies deeply rooted in culture and ideology and presented as opposites: objectivity/subjectivity, rational/emotional, mind/body, and male/female. An awareness of the differences in values that society places on the components of the above pairs is needed for women's success (Gilligan, 1982). Women administrators more often are guided by what Gilligan describes as "an injunction to care, a responsibility to discern and alleviate the 'real and recognizable trouble' of this world" while male administrators are informed by "an

injunction to respect the rights of others and thus to protect from interference the rights to life and self-fulfillment" (Shakeshaft, 1987, p.8).

Family and Career Role Conflict

Women seeking careers will have conflict over family responsibilities. Women are socialized to be primarily responsible for housework and child care influences their occupational goals (Marini & Brinton, 1984). Further, employers often discriminate against women on the unproven assumptions that the women's family responsibilities will impinge on their productivity on the job (England & Farkas, 1986).

As long as society continues to define the status of women in terms of their roles as wives and mothers, the conflict of career versus family will continue; society has prepared women to make a commitment to the family and not to a professional career (Clement, 1980).

Women have to learn to cope with not only the expectations of others, but also with their own feelings and self-role conflicts. Feminine ethics are such that women often feel guilty when combining career and family. They find they must make choices between their responsibilities of family and profession. This feeling of carrying "two jobs" is lessened when the spouse is accommodating. Support from the husband as well as the role the children assume in terms of helpfulness and independence are usually seen as

essential (Schmuck, 1976). Scarlette (1979) noted that the women in her study placed their family responsibilities first.

Organizations will have to address the issues women face because the pool of top executive talent includes women (Spruell, 1985). As yet, the use of alternative work schedules such as flextime is not widespread. Child care service is another issue facing working mothers. According to data from the Bureau of the Census in October 1980, there were 891,000 more children enrolled in nursery schools than in 1970--2.0 million compared with 1.1 million--an increase of more than 80%. The dramatic rise in working mothers has caused some changes in the management of child-care arrangements. Many companies have on-site child care centers (U.S. Department of Labor, 1983).

Mobility

Mobility is another factor which may hinder women more than men. McQuigg and Carlton (1980) cite a study of occupational mobility which indicated that men changed jobs more frequently than women. Although there are no guarantees, mobility does help women to get good jobs in educational administration. "Women who choose to stay put on one school system usually reach the top at a snail's pace" (Collins, 1976, p. 26). Women seem to have accepted the idea that outstanding competence in a certain job for an extended

period of time is the most appropriate manner of making professional progress (Hennig & Jardin, 1977). Men are more mobile and more aggressive in their search for career advancement (Lange, 1983).

According to Charlene Dale (1973), women in administration are treated differently than equally qualified men in comparable positions. Superiors hold certain tacit assumptions about women that make it difficult for them to advance. For example, it is simply assumed that a young woman will not be able to accept a new job if it means relocating her family. In a comparable situation, it would be assumed that a man would be free to move. "Women must choose between career and family in a manner that most men do not" (Whitaker, 1990, p. 9).

Aspirations

In a comprehensive, long-term study completed in 1981 by Anne Harlan and Carol Weiss at the Wellesley College Center for Research on Women, "no significant differences" were found between men and women managers in their need for power, dominance, self-esteem, or motivation to manage (Harlan & Weiss, 1981, p. 99).

For many aspiring females, education is the path to success. Educational institutions connect them to community and power (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1986). Amount of education is the area that has changed most for

women in administration in the '80's. Doctoral programs in administration report that 50% or more of their students are women, and more aspiring women administrators report working for advanced degrees. The woman administrator tends to return to the university while a teacher or administrator, with the master's degree completed in her early 30's and the doctorate in her 40's (Shakeshaft, 1987).

Graduate education serves as an informal process of interaction, socialization, and alliance with faculty. Faculty members become mentors to female students, and they help females locate positions which place them on the road to career mobility (Freeman, 1989).

Despite the consistent pattern of the increase in the numbers of females in doctoral programs, there are indications of shifts in women's choices in the 1980's. Roberson, Keith, and Page (1983) document the fact that fewer women with high academic qualifications are choosing to make their careers in education. Jones and Montenegro (1982) found that women involved in programs intended to help them overcome barriers to entering educational administration sometimes decide to leave public education as they learn more about the system and career possibilities. Many studies report that women doctoral students in educational administration, unlike their male counterparts, typically do not use their degrees to further careers in public school administration

but instead find employment as consultants and researchers or in government service (Boyan, 1988).

External Barriers

The participation of women in the labor force has been increasing steadily. But most women are employed at the lower levels of organizational hierarchies. Only a few women are in executive board rooms. Men continue to be the predominant group to occupy positions of power in medicine, in law, and in business and industry. The field of educational administration is no exception in this regard. In this field, as in others, women tend to be concentrated in the lower and middle echelons (Stansbury, Thomas, & Wiggins, 1984).

Personnel Selection

Organizational barriers occur in many aspects of an institution's functioning. Probably the most harmful hiring practice is the use of informal hiring criteria which strongly favor male applicants in determining which applicant is most capable of doing the job. Since it is common for several applicants to meet for formal criteria for an administrative position, those making the hiring decision must turn to other criteria for selecting among the formally qualified. It is clear that the decision-makers do not necessarily select the person who best meets the formal criteria. If that were the case, in a situation where the formal criteria required that

an applicant have a minimum of three years teaching experience to become an elementary school assistant principal, a woman applicant with 15 years of elementary school experience would presumably be selected over a man with only three years of teaching experience in high school. However, since too often a man who meets the minimum criteria is selected, it is clear that the decision-makers treat the formal criteria as merely threshold factors. Once an applicant's qualifications pass that threshold, the decision-makers turn to other criteria to select among those qualified. "Leadership potential" and "career interest" are the unstated factors for their subjective selection (Sex Discrimination in Schools, Women's Educational Equity Act Program, 1978). Women are also invited to interview as tokens, so that the interviewers can show their pursuit of affirmative action goals (Funk, 1986).

When women are hired into educational administration positions, they are sometimes placed in low-power positions that have no clear path for upward mobility. Women are more often in support than in line positions. This placement strategy limits a woman's normal career progression positions of power and authority in educational administration (Gupta, 1983).

Lack of Networks

The sex ratio at the upper levels of the agency also perpetuate barriers against the advancement of women. There

are simply more men than women in middle and upper managerial ranks. It is easier for males to obtain and retain organizational power (Funk, 1986). Studies have shown that top executives tend to promote people into leadership positions who are as much like them as possible ("Women of the Corporation," 1985). Lack of informal and formal social networks hampers women in attaining administrative positions (Whitaker & Lane, 1990).

Kleiman (1980) describes the male network well in

Women's Networks:

It is secret and it is informal, but it is such an inbred, automatic response that men don't think twice about it. Good Old Boys don't say, 'Well, today is the day to pick one of our own as the new vice president.' They just do it. Men grow up knowing all about how to network. They play team sports. They are taught to collaborate and work with each other. They learn not to hold grudges. Along with reading, writing, and arithmetic, they absorb the fact that they need each other. (p. 3)

Phi Delta Kappa, a leading professional fraternity in the field of educational leadership, excluded women from participation for most of its lengthy history. Women were invited to join in 1974 (Burstyn, 1980).

Network building is a complex strategy which connects people, institutions, agencies, and the like in such a way that they exchange information and resources (both human and material) to solve problems and implement change (U.S. Dept. of Education, 1980).

Power

Power means different things to men and women. A number of studies provide evidence that women use power to empower others. This sharing of power is based on the notion that power is not finite, but rather that it expands as it is shared (Shakeshaft, 1987). Powell (1988) suggested that women develop specific power strategies. Women can use four traditional managerial powers in advancing themselves to and through careers in management. The first of these powers is expert power, through which the woman influences people through her superior skill or knowledge. The second is informational power, the ability to provide evaluations to others about why they should believe or behave differently. The third is referent power, by which the woman influences others because they identify with her. Fourth is coercive power, through which the woman can bring negative sanctions (poor performance rating, low recommended raise) against others (Powell, 1980). Without real influence, women who hold formal titles of leadership cannot function effectively (Kanter, 1976).

Lack of Mentors

Most research on women seeking administrative positions includes comments by these women on the lack of mentors, sponsors, or support. During the 1970's the Oregon Network was developed to assist women and minorities. For women to

succeed in acquiring administrative positions in education, mentoring must occur (Whitaker & Lane, 1990). The psychological factors of mentors were deemed to be more helpful for women than men in a study by Paven (1986).

Daniel Levinson, in 1978, identified two issues that influence whether or not women have mentoring relationships in public schools. First, opportunities for mentoring are limited by the underrepresentation of females in administrative positions. In addition, cross-mentoring, between male mentors and female proteges, is frequently of lesser importance due to sex role attitudes. Therefore, it is most important for female aspirants to find a female mentor (Whitaker & Lane, 1990).

Few Women in Educational Policy Positions

A recent increase in the number of women school board members may signal gains for female administrators. The National School Boards Association (1974) reported in 1974 that women held 11.9% of the nation's school board positions. A survey in 1988 reported 31.9% women on school boards in the U.S. (Educational Vital Signs, 1989). Women represent 28.7% of the total membership on the North Carolina School Boards (person communication, Ed Dunlap, Associate Executive Director of North Carolina School Board Association, February 16, 1990).

No comparable shifts have occurred in other educational policy positions. Few women have occupied top positions in the U.S. Office of Education: In 1972, no women held Grade 18

positions and only two women held Grade 17 positions. The 1984 roster of the Department of Education confirms continuation of the preponderance of men in top positions, although at a point during the 1970's women headed the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Department of Education, and the National Institute of Education. In 1985, five women held the position of state superintendent (Boyan, 1988). North Carolina has two women assistant superintendents at the State Department of Public Instruction.

Profiles of Administrators

The female superintendent is likely to be married. Compared to males, a higher percentage of women superintendents are divorced, single, or widowed. Generally she has been on the career ladder longer than her male counterpart and has served in more administrative positions before reaching the superintendency. Her route to the superintendency consisted of several different positions: teacher, assistant principal, principal, and central office administrator (American Association of School Administrators, 1982).

Large inner cities have a higher percentage of women administrators than do suburban, rural, or other urban areas. While 4% of superintendents in the suburbs and in rural areas are women, 13% of those in inner cities with a population of 150,000 or more are women (Feistritz, 1988).

For principals, the facts are the same, with rural schools showing a significantly higher ration of men to women

than the other areas--80% of principals in rural areas are men, compared with 60% who are in inner cities (Feistritzer, 1988). There is a greater proportion of women principals in public elementary school (30%) than in secondary schools (10%) (Feistritzer, 1988).

Rights and Limitations Under the Law

The single most significant factor in eliminating discrimination in education, according to regional conference participants in all sections of the country, has been the laws enacted by the government which promote equality, beginning with the Fourteenth Amendment (U.S. Dept. of State, 1980).

The Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment adopted in 1868 prohibits unreasonable discrimination. It does not, however, enumerate specific kinds of discrimination, thus making it necessary for courts to interpret (Marshall & Grey, 1982).

Title IX is implemented by local school districts. They decide on appropriate efforts, resources, and personnel to devote to the policy. Implementation is left to the decision-making and prioritizing processes of local administrators (Boyan, 1988). Marshall and Grey (1982) reported how the legal rights of women seeking administrative positions can be circumvented by ambiguity in job specifications, professional norms of loyalty, and difficulty in proving the superiors' assessments are in error.

Many women shy away from using the courts for fear of negative repercussions upon their careers. Timpano (1976) noted that

even when women are aware of discrimination and have evidence of it and know how to prosecute it, some of them hesitate to file complaints [fearing they will be] labeled 'troublemakers' and therefore [be] eliminated from future consideration for positions in their, or any other, district. (p. 19)

Matthews (1986) found that similar sentiment prevailed in the 1980's. In her 1986 dissertation on female administrators, she writes: "Some had reflected on what they would do if they were discriminated against and, for most, it was something short of a lawsuit" (p. 190).

Title IX is part of the Education Amendments of 1972. It prohibits sex discrimination in education programs or activities which receive federal financial assistance. The sanctions for violation of Title IX include the possible termination or prohibition of federal funding. Title IX's regulations were issued by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (now the Department of Education) through its office of civil rights.

In general, the employment regulations under Title IX prohibit:

- (1) exclusion from participation in, denial of the benefits of, or subjection to discrimination on the basis of sex of any person in employment, or recruitment, consideration, or selection thereof, whether full or part-time;

- (2) the limitation, segregation, or classification of applicants or employees in any way which would adversely affect any employment opportunities or status because of sex;
- (3) entrance by a recipient into any contractual or other relationship which directly or indirectly has the effect of subjecting employees of students to sex discrimination, including relationships with employment and referral agencies, with labor unions, and with organizations providing or administering fringe benefits to employees of the recipient.
- (4) the granting of preferences to applicants for employment on the basis of attendance at a single sex educational institution, unless the numbers of each sex eligible for such preference are roughly equivalent.

Specifically, discrimination is prohibited in:

- (1) recruitment, advertising, and the process of application for employment;
- (2) hiring, upgrading, promotion, tenure, demotion, transfer, layoff, termination, application of nepotism policies, right of return from layoff, and rehiring;
- (3) rates of pay or any other form of compensation;
- (4) job assignments, classifications, and structure, including position descriptions, lines of progression, and seniority lists;

- (5) the terms of any collective bargaining agreement;
- (6) granting and return from leaves of absence, leave for pregnancy and related conditions, leave for persons of either sex to care for children or dependents;
- (7) fringe benefits;
- (8) selection and financial support for training including apprenticeship, professional meetings, conferences, and other related activities, selection for tuition assistance, sabbaticals, and leaves of absence to pursue training;
- (9) employer-sponsored activities, including social or recreational programs;
- (10) any other term, condition, or privilege of employment (Ginn, 1989).

The legislation mandate of Title IX is broad, but legislation lives and dies, not by its mandate, but rather through its enforcement. Owing to the low priority placed on women's rights, public demand for enforcement of Title IX has been limited (Fox & Hesse-Biber, 1984).

Summary

Fruitful analysis of women's unequal participation in the field of educational administration requires employing new perspectives. The education system developed in response to societal needs and assumptions. The effective separation of education into two professions, based considerably on

gender, placed status and power in the hands of male administrators. The separation is perpetuated in textbooks, in parental and teacher perceptions, in school policies, societal attitudes, and limited legislative action. Inequality is deeply embedded in the society; laws and regulations are difficult to enforce.

Leaders in education must take the prime responsibility for initiating remedies to resolve the problem. As more women complete educational administration programs, they will become eligible for consideration for administrative jobs. Equity will occur as more women enter administration and demonstrate their competence. Attitudes of gatekeepers that have prevented their advancement in the past will change, thereby allowing more females to enter administration.

Women must be knowledgeable of the past, aware of the present, and focus on the future.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to present a profile analysis of female administrators in central office positions in North Carolina public schools in 1989. This chapter describes the research methodology and procedures involved in the study. Prior to the onset of the study, a review of the related literature was conducted using the Jackson Library at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro. The Education Index, Current Index to Journals in Education, Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature, Dissertation Abstracts International, and the card catalogs were reviewed to identify related literature and information. An ERIC as well as a JACLIN computer search were also conducted. Literature was obtained from the National Center for Education, U.S. Department of Labor, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, Women's Educational Equity Act Publishing Center, and The Center for Creative Leadership in Greensboro, North Carolina. The writer also attended a conference, Women in Educational Administration, on July 12-13, 1989, presented by the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, Division of Staff Development/Leadership Institute for Administrators.

Development of the Instrument

A preliminary instrument was adapted from the survey instrument used by Elaine Stiller in her dissertation, A Profile analysis of Female Administrators in Central Office Positions in North Carolina Public Schools, 1979. This instrument was revised to reflect current concerns with the assistance of Harold Snyder, Professor in Educational Administration, University of North Carolina at Greensboro; Rita O'Sullivan, Director of the Center for Educational Research, University of North Carolina at Greensboro; and Judy Penny, of Creative Computing Consultants.

The survey instrument contained 28 items organized in terms of four major areas: personal data, present position, experience and training, and plans for the future. Information such as the age, sex, marital status, number of children, and salary were included under personal data. The next part of the instrument presented data concerning the present position such as responsibilities, career planning, and qualifications. The third part examined the educational backgrounds of the women as to their professional preparation, degrees earned, major fields of study, previous educational positions, and factors hindering the completion of degree programs or attainment of administrative positions. The last section included plans for formal study, employment plans for the future, and suggestions for improving the professional advancement of women. (See Appendix A.)

Validation of the Instrument

The questionnaire was piloted by submission of the instrument for criticism of construction, design, and content to 14 women employed in the central office in Greensboro Public Schools. Twelve women (85%) responded and critiqued the instrument.

Preparation of the Cover Letter

A cover letter was prepared to accompany every mailed questionnaire. This letter explained the purpose of the study, emphasized its importance and significance, and assured the confidentiality of responses. The letter stated the endorsement of the North Carolina Association of Educators, Division of Principals and Administrators. A specific deadline date for the return of the questionnaire was given to discourage procrastination. A stamped, addressed, return envelope was included. (See Appendix B.)

Sample Selection

The North Carolina Education Directory, 1988-89 issued by the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction was the source for the listing of the 139 administrative units and the names and addresses of the female administrators in central office positions. To obtain a good cross-section in the survey, a simple random selection process was used. By definition the simple random sampling is as follows:

If a sample of size n is drawn from a population of Size N in such a way that every possible sample of size n has the same chance of being selected, the

sampling procedure is called simple random sampling. (Scheaffer, Mendenhall, & Ott, 1979, p. 31)

From 139 administrative units in North Carolina, 64 units were selected. For the survey, 139 is equal to N and 64 is equal to n . A simple random sample is obtained when every possible example of $n=64$ has the same chance of being selected. The digits in the table of Appendix C (Table of Random Numbers, pp. 102-105) were generated to satisfy the conditions of the simple random sampling.

Appendix D (Listing of Administrative Units in North Carolina, pp. 98-99), were numbered from 1-100 (county) and 1-39 (city). To arrive at the simple random sample, Appendix C (Table of Random Numbers) was used to select the female administrators in the 64 units surveyed. Two arbitrary numbers were selected, 7 and 12, for the county and city units. Using the (7) column of Appendix C (Table of Random Numbers), the last three digits of each number are dropped. The 69th unit on the listing of school units of North Carolina Administrative Units (Appendix D) is the first selected for the survey. (For example: the first number in column (7) on the Table of Random Numbers is 69179. When the last three digits are dropped, the number is 69. The process continues, using the 12 column for city, until 64 units are selected.)

The women selected from these 64 units were in administrative or staff positions attached to the central office who report directly to the superintendent or a member of the

superintendent's immediate team. The positions included superintendents, associate/assistant superintendents, coordinators, supervisors, directors, and all other persons in positions related to the functioning of the schools. Four hundred and eighty-eight female administrators were selected for the study.

Data Analysis

The Computer Center at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro was used to compile and analyze all data gathered from the completed survey instruments. The data were analyzed by a VAX 8700 computer using the SAS Statistical Package. Frequency distributions and percentages were calculated for each of the questions. Cross table frequency distributions were calculated for the following variables: position, salary, age, number of years position held, future plans, and formal study plans. Based on the frequency distribution of the two-way tables, it was determined that chi-square analysis was inappropriate due to the number of missing or low count cells. Ten items had blanks provided to explain or specify their checked responses. These comments, when provided, had to be tabulated individually due to the nature of the response. Responses to each of the items were organized in tables, analyzed, and summarized.

Summary

Female administrators in central office positions in North Carolina Public Schools were surveyed in an effort to provide a better understanding of the status of female administrators in current educational systems and to identify factors which promote success in acquiring an administrative position. Recommendations for aspirants in educational administration are needed for improving the advancement of women in the public schools of North Carolina.

CHAPTER IV
PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

This chapter presents data obtained from the questionnaires mailed to the 478 female administrators in central office positions in North Carolina public schools. From this number, 335 surveys were returned, representing a 70% response of the total number sampled. These surveys were used to collect the data pertaining to female administrators in central office positions in North Carolina public schools. Findings were summarized and tables were constructed using frequency distributions and percentages pertaining to each of the questions.

Personal Data of Women in Central Office Positions
Positions Held by Women

Five women held the highest level position of superintendent. Twenty-nine women were in the assistant and associate superintendent positions. Less than 10.5% of the respondents occupied these three top-level positions.

Twenty-nine women were general supervisors and 48 were subject area supervisors, a total of 23.7% of the sample. Those 178 respondents whose titles were included in the "other category (54.8%) held positions such as Director of Exceptional Children, Coordinator of Media Services,

Vocational Education Director, Supervisor of Guidance Services, Nutrition Supervisor, and Director of Public Information/Community Schools. Ten respondents omitted the title of their position. See Table 1.

Years in Present Position

Approximately three-fourths (72.8%) of the women who responded had occupied their present position for 10 years or less. Two women (0.6%) had been in their position for more than 25 years. Eighty women (23.6%) had held their positions between 10 and 20 years, 16.3% for 11 to 15 years, and 7.3% for the 16 to 20 year period (see Table 2).

The 5 superintendents, 4 of the 9 associate superintendents, and 12 of the 20 assistant superintendents, or 62% of those in these positions, had been in their positions for less than 5 years. Four associate and 6 assistant superintendents had been employed in this position for 6 to 10 years. One associate and 2 assistant superintendents had been employed in this position from 11 to 15 years. There were no respondents employed in their position more than 15 years. (See Table 3.)

Two hundred ninety-five women (89.1%) who responded had held their position from 1 to 15 years or less, with the largest percentage (52%) in the 0-5 year category. There were 3.6% of the respondents who had occupied their position for more than 20 years. As can be seen in Table 3, women in

Table 1

Distribution of Positions of Women

Title	Number	Percent
Superintendent	5	1.5
Associate Superintendent	9	2.8
Assistant Superintendent	20	6.2
Director of Instruction	17	5.2
General Supervisor	29	8.9
Subject Supervisor	48	14.8
Director of Special Projects/ Federal programs	19	5.8
Other (Includes Exceptional Children Director, Coordinator of Media Services, Vocational Education Director, Supervisor of Guidance Services, Director of Public Information/Community Schools, and Supervisor of Nutrition	178	54.8
Total	325	100.0

Table 2

Years in Present Position

Number of Years	Number	Percent
0-5 years	172	52.0
6-10 years	69	20.8
11-15 years	54	16.3
16-20 years	24	7.3
21-25 years	10	3.0
Over 25 years	2	0.6
Total	331	100.0

Table 3

Relationship Between Years in Position and Titles

Title	Years in Position											
	0-5 Yrs.		6-10 Yrs.		11-15 Yrs.		16-20 Yrs.		21-25 Yrs.		Over 25 Yrs.	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Superintendent	5	1.5										
Associate Superintendent	4	1.2	4	1.2	1	.3						
Assistant Superintendent	12	4.0	6	2.0	2	.6						
Director of Instruction	11	3.4			4	1.2	1	.3	1	.3		
General Supervisor	17	5.3	4	1.2	5	1.6	1	.3	1	.3		
Subject Supervisor	26	8.1	9	2.8	8	2.5	3	.9	1	.3	1	.3
Director of Special Projects/ Federal Programs	6	1.9	4	1.2	6	1.9	2	.6	1	.3		
Other	<u>87</u>	<u>27.0</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>12.0</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>8.1</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>5.3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>1.9</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>.3</u>
Total	168	52.4	66	20.4	52	16.2	24	7.4	10	3.1	2	.6

the top level positions have been in these positions for less than 5 years. Women have obtained these positions in educational administration in the last 10 to 15 years.

Distribution of Ages

Ages ranged from under 25 to more than 65 years of age (see Table 4). The median age range for respondents was 41-45 years. Approximately 70% of the women who responded were over 40 years old. Only 3% of respondents were less than 30 years old. (See Table 4.)

Marital Status

Married women represented 73.4% (245) of the total number of respondents. Single women represented 8.7% (29), and widowed or divorced women represented 18% (60) of the respondents. (See Table 5.)

Number of Children

Seventy-three (21.9%) of the women had no children; 78 (23.4%) had one child. The largest number of respondents, 118 (35.3%), had two children. Forty-two women (12.6%) had three children, and 23 (6.9%) had four or more children.

Salaries

The salaries of the respondents ranged from less than \$20,000 to more than \$51,000. Most of the women (72.4%) received a salary in the range of \$30,000-\$50,000. Almost one-fifth of the women (18.6%) received salaries less than

Table 4

Age of Subject

Age	Number	Percent
Under 25 years	3	0.9
26-30 years	8	2.4
31-35 years	24	7.2
36-40 years	65	19.5
41-45 years	86	25.7
46-50 years	69	20.7
51-55 years	48	14.4
56-60 years	13	3.9
61-65 years	<u>18</u>	<u>5.4</u>
Total	334	100.0

Table 5

Present Marital Status

Marital Status	Number	Percent
Single	29	8.7
Married	245	73.4
Widowed	14	4.2
Divorced	<u>46</u>	<u>13.8</u>
Total	334	100.0

Table 6

Number of Children Subject Has

Children	Number	Percent
None	73	21.9
One	78	23.4
Two	118	35.3
Three	42	12.6
Four	17	5.1
Five	2	0.6
Six	1	0.3
More than six	<u>3</u>	<u>0.9</u>
Total	334	100.0

\$30,000. Nine percent of the women received salaries over \$51,000. (See Table 7.)

The highest level positions did receive the highest salaries (over \$51,000). All the women in top level positions received more than \$40,000. One woman did not respond to this item. (See Table 8.)

Type of District Where Employed

One hundred ninety-six women (59.8%) were employed in county school districts. Sixty-eight women (10.7%) were employed in city school districts, and 64 women (19.5%) were employed in consolidated school districts.

School districts with a pupil population of 1,000 to 5,000 employed the largest number of respondents (36.4%). School districts with pupil populations of 6,000-10,000 and 11,000-15,000 had 46 women (13.9%) who responded. Twelve women (3.6%) were in school districts with more than 50,000 pupils. Units with 16,000 to 50,000 pupil population employed 38.5% of the respondents. School districts with less than 1,000 pupils employed 1.2% of the respondents. (See Table 9.)

Present Positions of the Women

Position Responsibilities

Women employed in central office positions were requested to identify the responsibilities of their work. Table 10 presents these job responsibilities. Evaluation of Personnel

Table 7

Present Yearly Salary

Salary	Number	Percent
\$20,000 or less	7	2.1
\$21,000-\$30,000	55	16.5
\$31,000-\$40,000	128	38.3
\$42,000-\$50,000	114	34.1
Over \$51,000	<u>30</u>	<u>9.0</u>
Total	334	100.00

Table 8

Distribution of Salaries by Position Held

Position	Salary									
	\$20,000 Or Less		\$21,000- \$30,000		\$31,000- \$40,000		\$41,000- \$50,000		Over \$51,000	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
Superintendent									5	1.5
Associate Superintendent							4	1.2	5	1.5
Assistant Superintendent							9	2.8	11	3.4
Director of Instruction					7	2.2	10	3.1		
General Supervisor			4	1.2	15	4.6	10	3.1		
Subject Supervisor			8	2.5	25	7.7	13	4.0	1	.3
Director of Special Projects/ Federal Programs	1	.3	4	1.2	8	2.5	6	1.9		
Other	<u>6</u>	<u>1.9</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>12.0</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>21.3</u>	<u>56</u>	<u>17.3</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>2.5</u>
Total	7	2.2	55	16.9	124	38.3	108	33.4	30	9.2

Table 9

Type School District Where Employed and PupilPopulation of School District

	Number	Percent
Type of District		
City	68	20.7
County	196	59.8
Consolidated	<u>64</u>	<u>19.5</u>
Total	328	100.0
Pupil Population		
Less than 1,000	4	1.2
1,000-5,999	121	36.4
6,000-10,999	46	13.9
11,000-15,999	46	13.9
16,000-20,999	52	15.7
21,000-25,999	25	7.5
26,000-30,999	3	0.9
31,000-35,999	10	3.0
36,000-40,999	11	3.3
46,000-49,999	2	0.6
50,000 and over	<u>12</u>	<u>3.6</u>
Total	332	100.0

Table 10

Responsibilities of Position

Area	Number	Percent
Curriculum	155	46.7
Instructional Program	177	53.3
Coordinate Special Program	207	62.3
Plan Special programs	152	45.8
Special Services	52	15.7
Staff Development	238	71.7
Public Relations	182	54.8
Financial Reports	233	70.2
Personnel Recruitment	185	55.7
Personnel Assignment	163	49.1
Materials/Equipment	236	71.1
Personnel Evaluation	240	72.3
Construction/Facilities	105	31.6
Other	67	20.2

(72.3%), Staff Development (71.7%), Material/Equipment (71.1%), and Financial Reports (70.2%) were the most checked responsibilities of these women. Assigned duties given by superior was the most frequent response for "other" category.

Factors Influential for Seeking Present Position

The largest cluster of women respondents (70.2%) identified personal interest in attaining leadership positions as the most influential factor in seeking their present position. A desire for higher income was the second leading factor which influenced 48.8% of the women who responded. Encouragement of a superior was the third leading factor which influenced 47.3% of the respondents. "Other" was an identifiable factor for 16.3% of the respondents. (See Table 11.)

Plans to Enter Administration

Approximately half of the women respondents (51.6%) formulated career plans for entering administration after classroom teaching experience. Only 12.2% of respondents had planned to enter the administration field before they had acquired classroom teaching experience. The category "other" was checked by 16.3% of the respondents. Explanations such as "at the right place, at the right time," "no planning," "in elementary school," "in high school," and "superintendent called me" were given by the women respondents as reasons for seeking administrative positions. (See Table 12.)

Table 11

Factors Influencing Desire to Seek Present Position

Factor	Number	Percent
Influence of college teacher	13	3.9
Influence and encouragement of superior	157	47.3
Personal interest in attaining leadership position	233	70.2
Influence of family	44	13.3
Desire for higher income	162	48.8
Desire to leave teaching	21	6.3
Other factors	54	16.3

Table 12

Plans to Enter Administration

	Number	Percent
As undergraduate	38	12.2
Graduate before teaching	8	2.6
Graduate after teaching	161	51.6
Other	<u>105</u>	<u>33.7</u>
Total	312	100.0

Planning to Acquire Position

A significant number of women (37.9%) indicated they had acquired their present position by chance. Many women (27.8%) had a slow career plan that evolved over a period of more than 10 years, and some women (16.4%) had a rapid career plan that evolved within the previous 5 years. Only 57 women (18%) had a deliberate career plan. (See Table 13.)

Achievement of Position

One hundred forty-five women (46.9%) acquired their positions through encouragement and an offer from within the school system where they were presently working. A fourth of the respondents (23.3%) had filed an application while employed in another system. An almost equal pool of respondents (25.6%) had applied for the position in their school system and had received the appointment. Thirteen women checked "other." (See Table 14.)

Qualifications Required for Position

The respondents identified factors required for achieving their present position. Ability to cooperate and relate to other people and ability to communicate effectively were considered by the majority of women to be required for their positions (91.9% and 87.1% respectively). Dedication to the profession was the third leading qualification checked by women (81.1%). Previous leadership roles was given by 75.4%

Table 13

Career Plan for Achieving Position

Q12	Number	Percent
Deliberate plan	57	18.0
Slow plan	88	27.8
Rapid plan	52	16.4
Purely chance	120	37.9

Table 14

How Present Position Was Obtained

Q13	Number	Percent
Offer from within system	145	46.9
Apply from within system	72	23.3
Apply from elsewhere	79	25.6
Other	13	4.2

of those surveyed as a qualification factor. Two hundred forty-one (72.4%) women checked degrees beyond the baccalaureate as a needed qualification. Approximately half of the women (52.6%) checked personal ambition as a qualification. Less than half of the women (41.1%) who responded checked prior administrative experience as a necessary qualification. Table 15 presents these data.

Predecessor in Position

Most of the women who answered the survey succeeded a woman when they achieved their present position (44.7%). Almost a third of the women (32.8%) did not succeed anyone. Only 22.5% of the women had succeeded a man when appointed to their present position. (See Table 16.)

Positions Now Held by Predecessors

The largest number of predecessors, a total of 79 (25.5%), had retired. The second largest category, "other," included 55 responses (17%). This group included responses such as "unknown," "moved to same position in another system," "accepted higher education position," "employed at the State Department of Public Instruction," and "deceased." All other positions currently held had less than 6% response in each category. (See Table 17.)

Immediate Superior

More than a third of the women respondents (35.3%) were directly responsible to the assistant superintendent. Almost

Table 15

Qualifications Required to Hold Present Position

Qualification	Number	Percent
Graduate degree	241	72.4
Successful teaching	218	65.5
Dedication to profession	270	81.1
Previous leadership	251	75.4
Ability with people	306	91.9
Prior administrative experience	137	41.1
Ability to communicate	290	87.1
Personal ambition	180	54.1
Available when open	175	52.6
Other	23	6.9

Table 16

Person Women Succeeded in Position

	Number	Percent
Man	74	22.5
Woman	147	44.7
No one/new position	108	32.8

Table 17

Position Predecessor Now Holds

	Number	Percent
Superintendent	6	1.9
Associate Superintendent	4	1.2
Assistant Superintendent	8	2.5
Director of Instruction	7	2.2
General Supervisor	13	4.0
Principal	13	4.0
Position outside education	18	5.6
Other	55	17.0
Teacher	12	3.7
Retired	79	24.5

a third of the women respondents (31.9%) were directly responsible to the superintendent. Less than 20% (17.0%) reported to the associate superintendent. Fifty women (15.8%) were responsible to other individuals holding positions such as directors or coordinators. (See Table 18.)

Males (79.5%) held the majority of positions to which the women were responsible. (See Table 18.)

Experience and Training

Age When Assumed First Position

Table 19 presents the age ranges when women in the central office positions first assumed their supervisory or administrative position. The largest group was from 36-40 years old when first appointed, followed closely by those from 31-35 years old. Seventy-four women (22.4%) were 25-30 years old when first appointed. Only five women (1.5%) were 51 to 55 years old when first appointed.

Positions Held Prior to Present Position

Women (56.5%) assigned to central office positions began their career in education as teachers. Their second position included a wider range of positions than the first one, but a significant number (27.5%) were in teaching. The category, "other," was identified significantly in the third and fourth previous positions (39.7% and 57.9% respectively). (See Table 20.)

Table 18

Position and Sex of Immediate Superiors of the Women

	Number	Percent
Directly responsible to		
Superintendent	101	31.9
Associate Superintendent	54	17.0
Assistant Superintendent	112	35.3
Other	50	15.8
Sex of person in superior position		
Male	256	79.5
Female	66	20.5

Table 19

Age When Assumed First Supervisory/Administrative Appointment

Age	Number	Percent
Under 25 years	27	8.2
25-30 years	74	22.4
31-35 years	84	25.4
36-40 years	85	25.7
41-45 years	38	11.5
46-50 years	17	5.1
51-55 years	5	1.5
56-60 years	1	0.3

Table 20

Positions Held Prior to Present Position

Position	<u>Previous Positions</u>							
	First		Second		Third		Fourth	
	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.	No.	Pct.
No previous position	61	18.4	1	0.6			1	5.3
Teacher	187	56.5	48	27.3	15	23.8	3	15.8
Principal/Assistant	8	2.4	30	17.0	12	19.0	4	21.1
Supervisor	5	1.5	11	6.3	8	12.7		
Librarian			7	4.0				
Guidance Counselor	2	0.6	8	4.5	2	3.2		
SDPI Consultant	4	1.2	1	0.6	1	1.6		
Other	58	17.5	69	39.2	25	39.7	11	57.9
Non-public Ed	6	1.8	1	0.6				

Degrees Earned and Major Fields of Study

Table 21 gives the degrees earned by the respondents. Two hundred ninety-one women had earned a bachelor's degree. Only three women checked that they did not hold a bachelor's degree. Two hundred forty-four women had earned a master's degree. Twenty-six women held two master's degrees, seventy-eight women held an educational specialist degree/advanced certificate, and forty-one women had earned a doctorate.

Table 21 presents the major fields of study for each degree. Education and administration were the predominant areas of study for the first master's degree. Administration was the predominant area of study for the second master's degree, educational specialist degree, and doctoral degree.

Factors Prohibiting Completion of Graduate Program

The respondents who did not complete a graduate degree indicated the factors that hindered their completion. Twenty-six women checked that the responsibilities of their present job were too demanding. Nineteen responses indicated that the location of the educational institution was inconvenient. Sixteen responses indicated the academic schedule of the educational institution was not convenient. Six women indicated that finances were a factor, and four checked that lack of family support was a contributing factor. Nineteen respondents checked "other," listing parenting responsibilities, children, re-location, marriage, pregnancy, and attitudes of professors as obstacles. (See Table 22.)

Table 21

Degrees Earned With Major Field of Study

Degree/Major	Number
Bachelor's Degree	
Early Childhood	66
Education	40
Special Ed	4
Library Science	1
Business	14
Sociology	5
Psychology	11
English	35
Science	1
Home Economics	37
Math	9
Social Studies	3
Music	3
Health/PE	11
Administration	3
Other	43
First Master's Degree	
Early Childhood	30
Education	41
Special Ed	17
Vocational Ed	1
Library Science	12
Guidance	16
Business	6
Psychology	6
English	3
Science	2
Home Economics	8
Math	2
Social Studies	1
Music	1
Health/PE	5
Superv/Curr	9
Administration	48
Other	29

Table 21 (continued)

Degree/Major	Number
Second Master's Degree	
Education	1
Psychology	1
Health/PE	1
Superv/Curr	1
Administration	19
Other	2
Education Specialist/Sixth Year	
Early Childhood	1
Education	2
Special Ed	2
Vocational Ed	2
Psychology	1
Superv/Curr	6
Administration	54
Other	3
Doctoral Degree	
Education	2
Special Ed	1
Vocational Ed	1
Library Science	1
Guidance	1
Psychology	3
Home Economics	1
Superv/Curr	7
Administration	21
Other	3

Table 22

Factors Prohibiting Completion of Graduate Program

Factor	Number	Percent
Responsibilities of present job too demanding	26	52.0
Academic schedule of institute inconvenient	16	32.0
Lack of family support	4	8.0
Finances	6	12.0
Location of educational institution inconvenient	19	38.0
Other	19	38.0

Difficulty in Obtaining Administrative Position

The majority of respondents (76.4%) indicated that they did not experience any difficulty in obtaining an administrative position. Thirty-one women (9.7%) indicated difficulty, and 44 women (13.8%) experienced some difficulty. (See Table 23.)

Factors Attributed to Difficulty in Obtaining Position

Table 24 presents the factors which were identified by the respondents as obstacles encountered when seeking an administrative position. Eighteen women checked community tradition, and 15 women marked prejudice against women as leading obstacles for obtaining an administrative position. Seven women indicated no available openings as a factor. Six women answered that lack of experience was an obstacle. Three women indicated lack of professional training as a factor.

Eight women indicated "other" as a cause. The reasons stated were "political considerations," "racial prejudice," "board members' prejudice," "sister in administrative position," "no feedback for reason rejected," "jealousy of immediate supervisor," "state is nonprogressive," and "difficult to obtain top level but easy to obtain supervisory levels."

Table 23

Difficulty in Obtaining Administrative Positions

	Number	Percent
Yes	31	9.7
No	243	76.4
Somewhat	44	13.8

Table 24

Factors Attributed to Difficulty in Obtaining Position

Factor	Number
Community tradition	18
Lack of interest	2
Personal preference for teaching	1
No available openings	7
Unwilling to re-locate	4
Lack of professional preparation	3
Lack of experience	6
Prejudice against women	15
Other	8

Plans for the Future

Plans for Further Formal Study

Approximately one-third of the women (35.1%) did not plan to pursue more formal study. More than one-third of the women (38.7%) surveyed checked that they would possibly or probably pursue further study. Less than one-third of the women (26.2%) planned to continue formal studies.

(See Tables 25 and 26.)

Future Employment Plans

Almost one-half of the women (48.5%) expected to continue in their present position. One-fifth of the women (21.2%) indicated their hope of being promoted in their system. Twenty women (6.5%) had retirement plans for the future, and 18 women (5.9%) indicated plans to leave public education. Twenty women (6.5%) had expectations to obtain a position in a larger system, and 3 women (1%) had expectations to obtain a position in another system of the same size or smaller. (See Table 27.)

Preference for Next Position

Only 12 women (5.5%) indicated a preference for a superintendent position. Thirteen women (6%) preferred an associate superintendent position. Forty women (18.4%) desired an assistant superintendent position. Twenty women (9.2%) expressed an interest in a director of instruction

Table 25

Plans for Further Formal Study

	Number	Percent
Yes	86	26.2
No	115	35.1
Possibly	106	32.3
Probably	21	6.4

Table 26

Plans for Further Study and Age of the Women

Subject's age	Yes	No	Possibly	Probably
Under 25 years	3 (1.0%)	0	0	0
26-30 years	2 (15.0%)	3 (37.5%)	3 (37.8%)	0
31-35 years	10 (41.7%)	3 (12.5%)	11 (45.8%)	0
36-40 years	24 (37.5%)	11 (17.2%)	26 (40.6%)	3 (4.7%)
41-45 years	24 (28.9%)	18 (21.7%)	34 (41.0%)	7 (8.4%)
46-50 years	16 (24.2%)	25 (37.9%)	19 (28.8%)	6 (9.1%)
51-55 years	6 (12.6%)	29 (60.5%)	10 (20.9%)	3 (6.3%)
56-60 years	1 (7.7)	9 (69.2%)	1 (7.7)	2 (15.4%)
61-65 years	0	16 (88.9%)	2 (11.1%)	0

Table 27

Plans for Future Employment

	Number	Percent
Continue present	149	48.5
Hope promoted	65	21.2
Same/larger system	20	6.5
Same/equal/smaller system	3	1.0
Retire in 2 years	20	6.5
Leave public education	18	5.9
Other	32	10.4

position. Only 10 individuals (4.6%) indicated a preference for a principalship. Six women (2.8%) wished to become professors. The largest number of women (52.5%) stated a preference for a position in the "other" category, which included such positions as state department official, college instructor, private consultant, and retirement. (See Table 28.)

Improving Women's Professional Advancement in Administration

Advanced training, persistence in applying, and equal consideration with men for positions were the leading factors for improving women's representation in educational administration. Networking, female attitudes, mentors, and willingness to hire women were also checked as significant factors. Federal and state legislation, political pressure, and patience were checked as least effective means for improvement. The other category included responses such as more female board members, public awareness, training sessions for dealing with the "good old boy" system of promotion and management. (See Table 29.)

Table 28

Preference for Next Position

Position	Number	Percent
Superintendent	12	5.5
Associate Superintendent	13	6.0
Assistant Superintendent	40	18.4
Director of Instruction	20	9.2
Principal	10	4.6
Assistant Principal	2	0.9
Professor	6	2.8
Other	114	52.5

Table 29

Improving Women's Professional Advancement
in Administration

	Number	Percent
Obtaining advanced degree	216	65.1
Persistence in applying for administrative positions	214	64.5
Equal consideration with men for available positions	243	73.2
Willingness of school boards to hire women administrators	198	59.6
Having a mentor	143	43.1
Networking	174	52.4
Attitude change by women concerning their own capabilities	194	58.4
Passage of federal and state legislation requiring equal opportunities for men and women	72	21.7
Political pressure by women's groups	60	18.1
Patience for time to bring changes	50	15.1
Other	40	12.0

CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Public schools are human systems composed of a multitude of parts, each part intersecting and connecting with others. A school district can be thought of as a system; certainly, teachers, students, and administrators are an integral part of that system, but a school is not an isolated entity. Schools connect to the adult community of parents and citizens, to local, state, and national politicians, to local and state school boards, and to the preparation programs in universities. All of these parts have influence and control on the men and women in educational administration.

Organizations function in part on sociological, psychological, and political dimensions. Little change happens in an organization without an awareness and power base.

In a field dominated exclusively by men, women who successfully occupy leadership positions in public school administration can provide a rich source of information relevant to the women who aspire to become educational administrators. There is a need for more data concerning the personal characteristics, training and experiences, work patterns, and career paths of women who occupy administrative positions.

The purpose of this study was to determine the status of female administrators, the personal and professional background, the future plans, and the recommendations of the women who were employed in the central administrative offices of North Carolina's public schools in 1989. Specifically, the purposes were:

1. To determine the types of administrative positions held by women in the public schools.
2. To determine the number of years women have held an administrative position.
3. To determine the duties and responsibilities of the women in administrative positions.
4. To identify the types of problems women may have encountered in acquiring administrative positions.
5. To ascertain possible reasons women believe they were promoted or hired for their administrative position.
6. To examine the personal background of women in administrative positions.
7. To examine the professional background and training of women in administrative positions.
8. To determine the future plans of the women currently in administrative positions.
9. To identify strategies for improving the professional advancement of women in education.

Data for the study were gathered from the women listed in the Education Directory for 1988-89. Questionnaires were sent to 478 women who were selected by using a random sample process from the 139 school administrative units in North Carolina. A total of 335 (70%) usable responses were analyzed for the data presentation. This study was a descriptive survey with the purpose of collecting data that would be useful for women aspiring to become administrators in the 1990's. The results were presented in narrative and tabular form. Frequency distributions and percentages were calculated for each of the questions. Cross table frequency distributions were calculated for the following variables: position, salary, age, number of years position held, future plans, and formal study plans.

To give the reader a profile of these women, major points follow:

1. The women who responded held positions of superintendent (1.5%), associate superintendent (2.8%), assistant superintendent (6.2%), director of instruction (5.2%), general supervisor (8.9%), subject area supervisor (14.8%), director of special projects/federal programs (5.8%), and other positions including director of exceptional children, director of vocational education, supervisor of guidance services, director of public information/community schools, and supervisor of nutrition (54.8%).

2. A majority of the women had been employed in their present position for 10 years or less (72.9%). Eighty women (23.6%) had occupied their positions between 10 and 20 years. Twelve women (3.6%) had been in their positions for more than 21 years.
3. Approximately 70% of the women were over 40 years of age. Ages ranged from 25 to more than 65 years of age. Only 11 women (3%) were less than 30 years old.
4. Married women represented the majority (73.4%). Single, widowed, or divorced represented approximately a third of the sample (26.8%).
5. The largest number of respondents (35.8%) had two children. Seventy-three women (20.8%) had no children and 42 women (12.6%) had three children. Twenty-three women (6.9%) had four or more children.
6. The respondents reported salaries that ranged from less than \$20,000 to over \$50,000. Most of the women (72.4%) received a salary in the range of \$30,000-50,000. Only 18.6% of the women received salaries less than \$30,000, and only 9% of the women received salaries over \$50,000.
7. Most of the women (36.4%) were employed in districts with pupil populations between 1,000-5,999.
8. The respondents identified their position responsibilities as the following: personnel evaluation

(72.3%), staff development (71.7%), materials/equipment (71.1%), financial reports (70.2%), coordinate special programs (62.3%), personnel recruitment (55.7%), public relations (54.8%), instructional program (53.3%), personnel assignment (49.1%), curriculum (46.7%), plan special programs (45.8%), and construction and facilities (31.6%).

9. Personal interest was the leading response of 70.2% of the women. Desire for higher income was indicated by 48.8% of the respondents and encouragement of a superior by 47.3% of the respondents.
10. A majority of the women (51.1%) formulated plans to enter administration after acquiring classroom teaching experience. Only 12.2% of respondents had planned to enter administration before they acquired classroom teaching experience.
11. A large number of women (37.8%) indicated they had acquired their position by chance. Only 18% of the women had a deliberate career plan. For 17.8% of the women career plans evolved over a period of more than 10 years. Some women (16.4%) indicated a rapid plan within the last 5 years.
12. The majority of the women (46.9%) acquired their position through an offer from within the system where they were currently employed. A fourth of the

respondents (25.6%) had filed an application while employed in another system, and an almost equal group of women (23.3%) had filed an application in the school system for appointment.

13. Ability to cooperate and relate to other people was considered as the most important qualification for obtaining position by 91.9% of the women. Ability to cooperate and relate to other people was identified by 87.1% of the women. Dedication to the profession was the third leading factor checked by 81.8%. Half of the women (52.6%) indicated personal ambition as a qualification. Previous leadership roles, graduate degrees, and administrative experience were also cited as prerequisites.
14. A total of 44.7% of the women checked that their predecessor was a woman. Almost a third of the women (32.8%) were the first to hold such a position within their administrative unit. A small number (22.5%) had succeeded a man.
15. Many women checked that their predecessor had retired, and 17% of the women marked "other," giving answers such as deceased, unknown, employed in another system, employed in higher education, employed in the state department.
16. The assistant superintendent was the immediate superior for 35.3% of the respondents. The superintendent was the immediate superior for almost a

third of the women (31.9%). The associate superintendent was indicated as immediate superior by 17.8% of the women. Fifty women (15.8%) were responsible to individuals with various titles. The majority (79.5%) of the individuals to whom the women were responsible were male.

17. Over half of the women (56.5%) reported that teaching was their prior experience for their first position. Principal/assistant principal, supervisor, librarian, guidance counselor, and SDPI consultant were cited as prior experience for administrative appointment.
18. Master's degrees had been earned by 73% of the women. Twenty-six held two master's degrees, 78 women held an educational specialist degree, and 41 women had earned a doctorate.
19. The women had majored in the humanities, social sciences, mathematics, or elementary education when acquiring the bachelor's degrees. Majors for the second master's degrees, specialist degrees, and doctorates were predominantly in supervision/curriculum and administration.
20. The majority of women (76%) indicated no difficulty in attaining an administrative position. Some women (24%) reported difficulty.

21. The factors attributed to difficulty in obtaining an administrative position were the following: community tradition, prejudice (race and sex), no openings, lack of experience, lack of professional available training, politics, North Carolina--nonprogressive state, absence of women in top level positions, mobility, and absence of women on school boards.
22. Approximately one-third of the women (35.1%) had no plans for further formal study. More than one-third (38.7%) checked that formal education was a possibility. The remaining number (26.2%) planned to continue formal studies. Plans for formal study were most prevalent among women administrators in the middle age range (36-45 years of age).
23. The women who expected to continue in their present position totaled 149 (48.5%). Another 21.2% hoped to be promoted within their present system. Twenty women (6.5%) desired the same position in a larger school system. Eighteen women (5.9%) had plans to leave public education. Twenty women (6.5%) had retirement plans for the future.
24. The superintendency was the next position desired by twelve women (5.5%). Fifty-three women (24.4%) desired an assistant/associate superintendent

position. Only 10 women (4.6%) expressed a desire for a principal's position. Six women (2.8%) opted for a position in higher education. The largest number of women (52.5%) stated a preference for "other" which included such positions as state department official, professor, consultant, and retirement.

25. Equal consideration with men was the leading factor for professional advancement. Advanced training and persistence in applying for positions were ranked second and third respectively. Networking, female attitudes, mentors, and willingness to hire women were checked as significant factors. Federal and state legislation, political and patience were checked as the least significant. More female board members, public awareness, training sessions for dealing with the "good old boy" system of promotion and management were additional factors stated by the women.

The findings of this study led the writer to make the following suggestions for women who aspire to become an administrator:

1. Believe in yourself.
2. Find the facts about your district's recruitment, screening, and selection processes.
3. Obtain your certification in educational administration at a major university.

4. Find a mentor at the university.
5. Be visible--volunteer for extra tasks, committees, and club sponsorships.
6. Attend conferences.
7. Keep informed of the latest developments by reading professional magazines and journals.
8. Join professional organizations.
9. Identify and keep in touch with others who have the type position to which you aspire. You can learn from them.
10. Do not wait for a position; take chances, risk mobility.

Conclusions

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusions may be made:

1. The number of women in the position of superintendent has slowly increased. In 1979, one female superintendent was employed in the public schools of North Carolina; in 1989 the number had increased to only six superintendents. Women represent only 4% of the superintendents in North Carolina.
2. Significant numbers of women are found in staff positions requiring advisory-type duties. General and subject area supervisors and directors comprised 89.5% of the group who responded. By definition,

supervision is the provision of assistance of an advisory nature to line officers.

3. Top-level administrative positions held by women were achieved within the previous 5 years. Five superintendents, 4 associate superintendents, and 12 assistant superintendents comprised 62% of the top level female administrators.
4. Women in administrative positions are well qualified by experience and training. The respondents (73%) had earned master's degrees, and approximately 43% of the women held a second master's degree, advanced specialist degree, or doctorate. The women had held various professional positions prior to obtaining their position.
5. Women currently in administrative positions consider this position terminal. Almost one-half (49%) of the women expected to continue in their present position. However, 65 (30%) women expressed a desire for a top level position--superintendent, assistant/associate superintendent.
6. Women in staff positions encounter fewer problems in their quest for an administrative position. The majority of women (76%) indicated no difficulty in acquiring their present position. Approximately one-half of the women had not sought a position,

and this fact should be viewed as one of the reasons that they might have had no difficulty. Many women (37.8%) indicated they had acquired their position by chance. Some women (24%) reported community tradition, politics, lack of professional training and experience, prejudices (sex and race), male superiority at the management level, and school boards as the leading barriers.

7. Women must learn the skills needed for moving up into the administrative mainstream. Human relations skills were considered by 91.9% of the respondents to be necessary qualifications for achieving their positions. Dedication to the profession, previous leadership roles, graduate degrees, and experience were also cited as necessary prerequisites.
8. Marital status and children were examined. the majority of the women (73.4%) were married. Approximately one-third of the women (38.8%) had two children. An almost equal number of women had one child (23.4%) and no children (21.9%)
9. The future plans for these women (65%) involved formal study as a definite or possible future endeavor. The remaining third (35%) of the women had no plans to continue formal study.
10. The leading factor for advancement in the field of education reported by these women was equal

consideration with men. Advanced training, persistence in applying for positions, networking, female attitudes, mentors, and willingness of school systems to hire women were also cited by the respondents. Federal and state legislation, politics, and patience were checked as the least significant. Some respondents stated that more female board members, public awareness, training workshops for managerial skills in the "good old boy" system of promotion and management

As historical record has shown, women have always been second choice in the selection of school leaders. The barriers today are not much different than the barriers that kept women from becoming administrators in 1900 or 1930. Internal barriers are rooted in societal attitudes. Lack of self-confidence comes from lack of experience. Women have limited participation in leadership areas; therefore, they have less confidence. Lack of aspiration or motivation may be a reflection of the reality of opportunities. Kanter's (1977) assertion that "things may become evaluated as less desirable as they become less likely" (p. 140) is crucial to understanding women's aspiration levels.

Recommendations for Future Action

Recommendations for future action in promoting more women in administrative positions are the following:

1. Women who have achieved a leadership role in education should articulate a new vision and encourage and support women aspiring for administrative positions.
2. State, regional, or local policy boards should be influenced to adopt equity as an important educational and employment concern.
3. School districts should establish formal intern programs to prepare, hire, and promote women as administrators.
4. Colleges of Education should invite female administrators to the classroom and to the campus to discuss the issues relevant to equity in education.
5. Courses at the university level should be expanded to include women's experiences in administration.
6. Women should be added to faculties in educational administration.
7. The implementation of federal laws should be monitored by an appointed person for every school district.
8. Workshops or conferences should be conducted that address specific barriers to women in administration.
9. An extensive public awareness campaign should be developed by educational organizations and leaders

who are sensitive to women's concerns. Such a program would inform the public of the problem and its effects on education and society.

10. Women's advocacy groups should commit themselves to efforts to elect women to school boards, political offices, and other decision-making bodies.

Recommendations for Future Research

Further research on this topic should include the following:

1. Race, socioeconomic background, and cultural influence on these subjects should be studied as they pertain to the relationship between femininity and administrative success.
2. Similar research should be conducted at the high school level to include women in secondary principalships in North Carolina.
3. Additional studies should be conducted using the interview technique for the purpose of gathering data. This method would lessen the chances of misinterpreting questions and statements. At the same time it would provide the opportunity for making more accurate interpretations of the responses, even though it would be more time consuming.
4. Studies of females in central office positions should be replicated every five years to determine

and compare the differences which occur over a sustained period of time.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Association of School Administrators. (1975). Sex equality in educational administration. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- American Association of School Administrators. (1982). The American school superintendency, 1982. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Andrews, M. R. (1985). Reflections on a reality: The decline of female administrators in the public schools of North Carolina (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1985).
- Aquila, F. D. (1981). Title IX: Implications for education of women. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappan Educational Foundation.
- Baruch, G., Barnett, R., & Rivers, J. (1983). Lifeprints: New patterns of love and work for today's women. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1986). Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice, and mind. New York: Basic.
- Benokraitis, N., & Feagin, J. (1986). Modern sexism: Blatant, subtle, and covert discrimination. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bilken, S., & Brannigan, M. (Eds.). (1980). Women and educational leadership. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.
- Blair, F. D., & Ferber, M. A. (1986). The economics of women, men and work. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Block, J. (1984). Gender differences and implications for educational policy. In J. Block (Ed.), Sex role identity and ego development (pp. 207-252). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Blumenthal, K. (1986). Room at the top. Wall Street Journal, March 24, 1986, p. 7D.

- Boyan, N. J. (Ed.). (1988). Handbook of research on educational administration: A project of the American Educational Research Association, University of California, Santa Barbara. New York: Logman.
- Briggs, D. C. (1977). Celebrate yourself. Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Co.
- Brownmiller, S. (1984). Femininity. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Brubaker, D. L. (1982). Curriculum planning: The dynamics of theory and practice. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.
- Burstyn, J. N. (1980). Historical perspectives on women in educational leadership. In S. K. Biklen & M. B. Brannigan (Eds.), Women and educational leadership (pp. 65-75). Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.
- Chan, S. (1990), January). Salary Survey: How pay equity may narrow the salary gap. Working Woman, pp. 106-112.
- Chassler, S. (1986, January). The women who succeed. Working Woman, pp. 86-87, 102-103.
- Chodorow, N. (1978). The reproduction of mothering. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ciabattari, J. (1988, September). Managerial courage: What builds confidence for women. Working Woman, pp. 106-108, 220-221.
- Clabaugh, G. K. (1986). A history of male attitudes toward educating women. Educational Horizons, 64(3), 127-151.
- Clement, J. (1980). Sex bias in school administration. In S. Biklen & M. Brannigan (Eds.), Women and educational leadership (pp. 131-137). Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.
- Clifford, F. J. (1982). "Marry, stitch, die, or do worse": Educating women for work. In H. Kantor & D. B. Tyack (Eds.), Work, youth, and schooling: Historical perspectives on vocationalism in American education (pp. 223-268). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Collins, N. W. (1983). Professional women and their mentors: A practical guide to mentoring for the woman who wants to get ahead. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Cott, N. F. (1977). The bonds of womanhood. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Crandall, K., & Reed, D. (1983). Career patterns of female administrators in public schools. Washington State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 272 965)
- Dale, C. T. (1979). Women are still missing persons in administrative and supervising jobs. Educational Leadership, 31(5), 12-127.
- Dodgson, J. (1987). Do women in education need mentors? The Education Digest, 52(5), 26-28.
- Dopp, B. K., & Sloan, C. A. (196). Career development and succession of women to the superintendency. The Clearing House, 60(3), 120-126.
- Edson, S. K. (1987). Voices from the present: Tracking the female administrative aspirant. Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, 7(4), 261-277.
- Edson, S. K. (1988). Pushing the limits: The female administrative aspirant. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Educational Research Service. (1981). Survey: Attitudes toward women as school district administrators. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- England, D., & Farkas, H. (1982). The failure of human capital theory to explain occupational sex segregation. Journal of Human Resources, 17(3), 358-370.
- Farrant, P. A. (1986). Strategies and attitudes: Women in educational administration. National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 21(4), 1-19.
- Feistritzer, C. E. (1988). Profile of school administrators in the U.S. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Information.
- Foster, C. (1984). Women's changing roles. Plano, TX: Instructional Aides.
- Fox, M. F., & Hesse-Biber, S. (1984). Women at work. Mountainview, CA: Mayfield Publishing Co.

- Frankel, M., & Rollins, H., Jr. (1983). Does mother know best? Mothers and fathers interacting with preschool sons and daughters. Developmental Psychology, 19(5), 694-702.
- Freeman, J. (Ed.). (1989). Women: A feminist perspective. Mountainview, CA: Mayfield Publishing Co.
- Funk, C. (1986). The female executive in school administration: Profiles, pluses, and problems. Arlington, TX: Annual Conference for Women and Work. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 285 282)
- Funk, C. (1988). Career paths and work patterns of women in mid-management roles in business and education. Arlington, TX: Texas Woman's University, Conference on Women and Work. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 299 664)
- Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gimlin, H. (Ed.). (1981). The women's movement: Agenda for the '80s. Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly, Inc., Editorial Research Reports.
- Ginn, L. W. (1989). Women in public school administration: Their rights and limitations under the law. Cullowhee, NC: Western University. Conference speaker, Women in Educational Administration, July 12-13, Greensboro, NC.
- Goffman, E. (1979). Gender advertisements. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gotwalt, N., & Towns, K. (1986). Rare as they are, women at the top can teach us all. Executive Educator, 8(12), 13-14.
- Gough, P. (1976). Sexism: New issue in American education. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- Graham, P. A. (1971). Women in academe. In A. Theodore (Ed.), The professional woman (pp. 700-723). Mass: Schenkman Publishing Co.
- Gross, N., & Trask, A. (1976). The sex factor and the management of schools. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

- Group cites sex bias in American schools. (1987, September 29). Greensboro News & Record, p. B10.
- Gupta, N. (1983). The women's leadership project. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.
- Harlan, A., & Weiss, C. (1981). Moving up: Women in managerial careers. Working Paper No. 86). Wellesley, MA: Wellesley College, Center for Research on Women.
- Harragan, B. L. (1977). Games mother never taught you. New York: Warner.
- Hellwig, B. (1985, April). Women of the corporation, 1985. Working Woman, pp. 98-101, 146-150.
- Hennig, M., & Jardim, A. (1977). The managerial woman. New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday.
- Hoferek, M. J. (1986). Going forth. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Book Company.
- Jacobson, S. L. (1989). School management: Still a white man's game. The Executive Educator, 11(11), 19.
- Jones, E., & Montenegro, X. (1982). Sex and ethnic representation in school administration. Unpublished report, American Association of School Administrators.
- Kanter, H., & Tyack, D. B. (Eds.). (1982). Work, youth, and schooling: Historical perspectives on vocationalism in American education. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Kanter, R. (1977). Men and women of the corporation. New York: Basic Books.
- Kellerman, B. (1984). Leadership: Multidisciplinary perspectives. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kleiman, C. (1980). Women's networks. New York: Lippincott and Crowell Publishers.
- Klein, S. S. (Ed.). (1984). Handbook for achieving sex equity through education. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Lange, L. (1983). Women in school administration: Problems and possibilities. High School Journal, 66(2), 83-90.

- Leonard, P. Y. (1987). The underrepresentation of women and minorities in educational administration: Patterns, issues, and recommendations. Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, 7(3), 188-207.
- Levandowski, B. S. (1977). Women in educational administration: Where do they stand? NASSP Bulletin, 61(410), 101-102.
- Levin, M. (1988). Feminism and freedom. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Levine, S. L. (1987). Peer support for women in middle management. Educational Leadership, 2, 74-75.
- Lovelady-Dawson, F. (1980). Women and minorities in the principalship: Career opportunities and problems. NASSP Bulletin, 64(4), 18-28.
- Maienza, J. G. (1986). The female superintendent: Another perspective. Journal of National Association for Women Dean, Administrators, and Counselors, 49(3), 30-36.
- Marini, J., & Brinton, T. (1982). Sex differences in occupational aspirations and expectation. Sociology of Work and Occupations, 5, 151-174.
- Marshall, C., & Grey, R. (1982). Legal rights of women seeking administrative positions in local school districts. Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, 2(4), 253-259.
- Marshall, S. A. (1986). Women reach for the top spot. School Administrator, 43(10), 10-13.
- Matthews, E. (1986). Women in educational administration: Support systems, career patterns, and job competencies. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1986)
- McMurry, R. E. (1940). Education of women in a democracy. New London, CT: Connecticut Press.
- McQuigg, B. D., & Carlton, P. W. (1980). Women administrators and America's schools: A national dilemma. The High School Journal, 64(2), 50-54.
- Mertz, N. T., & Venditti, F. P. (1985). Advancing women in administration: Study of an intervention strategy. Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, 5(1), 31-41.
- Millman, M., & Kanter, R. M. (1975). Another voice: Feminist perspectives on social life and social science. New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday.

- Morrison, A. M., White, R. P., & Van Velsor, E. (1987). Breaking the glass ceiling: Can women reach the top of America's largest corporations? Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Naisbitt, J., & Aburdene, P. (1990). Megatrends 2000. New York: William Morrow and Co.
- Nannes, M. Y. (Ed.). (1980). United States women: Issues and progress in the UN Decade for Women 1976-85. Department of State Publication 9146. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- National Project on Women in Education. (1978). Taking sexism out of education. HEW Publication No. (OE) 77-01017. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. (1988). Women in administration: How far have we come? Network, 9(3), 2.
- North Carolina Education Directory. (1988-89). Raleigh, NC: State Department of Public Instruction.
- Ortiz, F. (1982). Career patterns in education: women, men and minorities in public school administration. New York: Praeger.
- Pavan, B. N. (1987). Mentoring certified aspiring and incumbent female and male public school administrators. Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, 7(4), 318-331.
- Peretti, P., & Sydney, T. (1985). Parental toy choice stereotyping and its effect on child toy preference and sex-role typing. Social Behavior and Personality, 12(2), 213-216.
- Pounder, D. G. (1988). The male/female salary differential for school administrators: Implications for career patterns and placement of women. Educational Administration Quarterly, 24(1), 5-19.
- Powell, G. (1980, May). Career development and the woman manager: A social power perspective. Personnel, pp. 22-32.
- Roberson, S., Keith, T., & Page, E. (1983). Now who aspires to teach? Educational Researcher, 2(6), 13-21.

- Romig, L. (1983). Women and the high school principalship: A comparison of male and female aspirations and career paths. Dissertation Abstracts International, 44, 2647A.
- Sanford, L. T., & Donovan, M. E. (1985). Women's self-esteem: Understanding and improving the way we think and feel about ourselves. New York: Penguin Books.
- Sarantos, S. T. (1988). On the relationship between femininity and administrative success: A study of the perceptions of selected senior-level North Carolina Community College female administrators. (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1988)
- Sarason, S. (1971). The culture of the school and the problem of change. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Scarlette, E. T. (1979). A historical study of women in public school administration from 1900-1977. (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1979).
- Schmuck, P. A. (1977). Sex equity in educational leadership: The Oregon story. Eugene: University of Oregon, Center for Educational Policy and Management.
- Schmuck, P. A. (1980). Changing women's representation in school management: A systems perspective. In S. Bilken & M. Brannigan (Eds.), Women and educational leadership (pp. 233-259). Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.
- Schmuck, P. A. (1986). Networking: A new word, a new game. Educational Leadership, 43(5), 60-61.
- Schuster, D., & Foote, T. (1990). Differences abound between male and female superintendents. The School Administrator, 47(2), 14-16, 18-19.
- Shafritz, J., Koeppe, R., & Sopere, E. (1988). The facts on file dictionary on education. New York: Facts on File Publishing.
- Shakeshaft, C. (1983). Androcentric bias in the Educational Administration Quarterly. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

- Shakeshaft, C. (1984). A gender at risk: Women in education. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 409-503.
- Shakeshaft, C. (1987). Theory in a changing reality. Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, 7(1), 4-19.
- Shakeshaft, C. (1987). Women in educational administration. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Shapiro, C. (1984). We'll sue your school board to win equity for women administrators. American School Board Journal, 171, 43-47.
- Sitterly, C., & Duke, B. (1988). A woman's place: Management. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Smith, M. A., Kalvelage, J., & Schmuck, P. (1982). Women getting together and getting ahead. University of Oregon, Center for Educational Policy and Management. Newton, MA: WEEA Publishing Co.
- Smith, S., Mazzairell, J. A., & Piele, P. K. (1981). School leadership: Handbook for survival. Eugene: University of Oregon, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational management.
- Spruell, G. (1985). Making it, big time: Is it really tougher for women? Training and Development Journal, July 17, 1985, pp. 31-33.
- Stansbury, K., Thomas, L., & Wiggins, T. (1984). Women in leadership and implications for affirmative action. Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, 4(2), 99-113.
- Stearman, D. J. (1987). Male and female superintendents compared nationally: Career implications for women in educational administration. Dissertation Abstracts International, 48, 1614A.
- Stiller, E. S. (1979). A profile analysis of women in central office positions in North Carolina public schools. (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1979).
- Stockard, J. (1980). Sex equity in education. New York: Academic Press.
- Stockard, J. (1984). Career patterns of high-level women school administrators. Journal of the national Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 48(1), 36-44.

- Sulowski, S. S. (1987). A descriptive profile of female line administrators in new York State. Dissertation Abstracts International, 48, 1616A.
- Tibbetts, S. L. (1980). The woman principal: Superior to the male? Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors, 43(4), 176-179.
- Timpano, D. (1976). Sex discrimination in the selection of school district administrators: What can be done? U.S. Educational Resources Information Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 089 562)
- Toward equity: Effective Title IX strategies K-postsecondary. (1979). California Coalition for Sex Equity in Education. Women's Educational Equity Act Program. Sacramento: California State Department of Education.
- Tyack, D. B., & Strober, M. H. (1981). Women and men in the schools: A history of the sexual structuring of educational employment (Grant No. NIE-G-79-0020). Stanford, CA: Stanford University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 211 588)
- U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. (1989). Current Population Survey, 1988.
- U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau. (1983). Handbook on women workers (Bulletin 298). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau. (1987). History of the Women's Bureau (September M-020). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau. (1988). Facts on U.S. working women, Fact Sheet No. 88-1. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau. (1988). 20 facts on women workers, Fact Sheet No. 88-2. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau. (1988). A working woman's guide to her job rights (Leaflet 55). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Weller, J. (1988). Women in educational leadership. (Monograph, Vol. 3, No. 4). Columbus: Ohio State University, Center for Sex Equity. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 304 742)

- Whitaker, K. S., & Lane, K. (1990). Is a woman's place in school administration? Women open the door to educational leadership. The School Administrator, 47(2), 8-12.
- Woo, L. C. (1985). Women administrators: Profiles of success. Phi Delta Kappan, 67(4), 285-288.
- Woolf, V. (1950). A room of one's own. New York: Harcourt Brace and World.

APPENDIX A
STATUS STUDY OF FEMALE NORTH CAROLINA ADMINISTRATORS

STATUS STUDY OF FEMALE NORTH CAROLINA ADMINISTRATORS

Personal Data

Please check the category that applies.

1. Title of present position:

a. <input type="checkbox"/> Superintendent	f. <input type="checkbox"/> Subject Area Supervisor
b. <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Superintendent	g. <input type="checkbox"/> Director of Special Federal Programs
c. <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Superintendent	h. <input type="checkbox"/> Other (give specific title)
d. <input type="checkbox"/> Director of Instruction	
e. <input type="checkbox"/> General Supervisor	

2. Number of years in above position:

a. <input type="checkbox"/> 0-5 years	c. <input type="checkbox"/> 11-15 years	e. <input type="checkbox"/> 21-25 years
b. <input type="checkbox"/> 6-10 years	d. <input type="checkbox"/> 16-20 years	f. <input type="checkbox"/> More than 25 years

3. Your age:

a. <input type="checkbox"/> Under 25 years	d. <input type="checkbox"/> 36-40 years	g. <input type="checkbox"/> 51-55 years
b. <input type="checkbox"/> 26-30 years	e. <input type="checkbox"/> 41-45 years	h. <input type="checkbox"/> 61-65 years
c. <input type="checkbox"/> 31-35 years	f. <input type="checkbox"/> 46-50 years	

4. Present marital status:

a. <input type="checkbox"/> Single	B. <input type="checkbox"/> Married	C. <input type="checkbox"/> Widowed	D. <input type="checkbox"/> Divorced
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

5. Number of children you have:

a. <input type="checkbox"/> None	c. <input type="checkbox"/> Two	e. <input type="checkbox"/> Four	g. <input type="checkbox"/> Six
b. <input type="checkbox"/> One	d. <input type="checkbox"/> Three	f. <input type="checkbox"/> Five	h. <input type="checkbox"/> More than six

6. Present yearly salary:

a. <input type="checkbox"/> 20,000 or less	c. <input type="checkbox"/> 31,000-40,000	e. <input type="checkbox"/> Over 51,000
b. <input type="checkbox"/> 21,000-30,000	d. <input type="checkbox"/> 41,000-50,000	

7. Type of school district where employed:

a. <input type="checkbox"/> City	c. <input type="checkbox"/> Consolidated
b. <input type="checkbox"/> County	d. <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please specify) _____

8. Pupil population of school district (average daily membership):

a. <input type="checkbox"/> Less than 1,000	e. <input type="checkbox"/> 16,000-20,000	i. <input type="checkbox"/> 36,000-40,000
b. <input type="checkbox"/> 1,000-5,000	f. <input type="checkbox"/> 21,000-25,000	j. <input type="checkbox"/> 41,000-45,000
c. <input type="checkbox"/> 6,000-10,000	g. <input type="checkbox"/> 26,000-30,000	k. <input type="checkbox"/> 46,000-50,000
d. <input type="checkbox"/> 11,000-15,000	h. <input type="checkbox"/> 31,000-35,000	l. <input type="checkbox"/> More than 50,000

Your Present Position

9. What are the responsibilities of your present position? (Check as many as apply.)
- a. Develop curriculum and/or written curriculum guides
 - b. Supervise instructional program
 - c. Coordinate special programs
 - d. Plan special programs (accreditation, Title IX)
 - e. Perform specialized services (testing, psychological)
 - f. Plan and/or coordinate staff development
 - g. Promote public relations program
 - h. Prepare financial reports and assist in budget
 - i. Recruit and screen personnel
 - j. Select and assign personnel
 - k. Select, procure and/or distribute materials and equipment
 - l. Evaluate performance of personnel
 - m. Recommend construction or renovation of facilities
 - n. Other (specify) _____
10. What were the factors influencing your decision to seek your present level of assignment? (Check as many as apply.)
- a. Influence of college teacher
 - b. Influence and encouragement of superior
 - c. Personal interest in attaining leadership position
 - d. Influence of family
 - e. Desire for higher level of income
 - f. Desire to leave teaching
 - g. Other. Explain _____
11. When did you begin planning to become an administrator?
- a. As an undergraduate
 - b. As a graduate student before teaching
 - c. As a graduate student after teaching
 - d. Other. Explain: _____
12. How would you describe your career plan relative to achieving your position?
- a. Deliberate career plan
 - b. Slow plan (evolved over more than 10 years)
 - c. Rapid plan (evolved within previous 5 years)
 - d. Purely chance
13. How was your present position obtained?
- a. Encouragement and offer from within your present school system
 - b. Application and subsequent appointment from within your present school system
 - c. Application and/or interview while employed elsewhere
 - d. Other. Explain: _____

14. What qualifications do you feel were required for the position you now hold? (Check as many as apply.)
- a. Degree(s) beyond the baccalaureate degree
 - b. Successful teaching experience
 - c. Dedication to profession
 - d. Previous leadership roles
 - e. Ability to cooperate with and relate to other people
 - f. Prior administrative experience
 - g. Ability to communicate effectively
 - h. Personal ambition
 - i. Available when position was open
 - j. Other. Explain: _____
15. In assuming your present position you succeeded:
- a. Man b. Woman c. No one/new position
16. If your answer to Question 15 was "a" or "b", check the position your predecessor now holds:
- a. Superintendent e. Supervisor i. Teacher
 - b. Associate Superintendent f. Principal j. Retired
 - c. Assistant Superintendent g. Position outside education
 - d. Director of Instruction h. Other. Specify: _____
17. You are directly responsible to:
- a. Superintendent c. Assistant Superintendent
 - b. Associate Superintendent d. Other. Specify: _____
18. Your superior is:
- a. Male b. Female

Experience and Training

19. What was your age when appointed to your first administrative or supervisory position in education?
- a. Under 25 years d. 36-40 years g. 51-55 years
 - b. 25-30 years e. 41-45 years h. 56-60 years
 - c. 31-35 years f. 46-50 years
20. Please list the degrees you hold, the year the degree was granted, your age when the degree was granted, and the major for each degree:

Degree	Year granted	Age when granted	Major

21. Please list previous educational positions, the number of years in each position, and the approximate size of the district in average daily membership when you changed positions.

Position	Years Held	Size of District

22. If admitted to a graduate program and you did not complete the degree, what factors hindered you? (Check as many as apply.)
- a. Responsibilities of present job too demanding
 - b. Academic schedule of educational institution inconvenient
 - c. Lack of support from family
 - d. Finances
 - e. Educational institution inconveniently located
 - f. Other. Specify: _____
23. Have you experienced any difficulties in obtaining an administrative position:
- a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Somewhat
24. If your answer to 23 was "yes", to what factors do you attribute the difficulty? (Check as many as apply.)
- a. Lack of professional preparation
 - b. Lack of experience
 - c. Prejudice against women
 - d. Community tradition
 - e. Lack of interest due to additional responsibility of the position
 - f. Personal preference for classroom teaching
 - g. No openings available in locality where you live
 - h. Unwilling to move
 - i. Other. Specify: _____

Plans for the Future

25. Do you plan further formal study?
- a. Yes
 - b. No
 - c. Possibly
 - d. Probably
26. What are your employment plans for the future?
- a. Expect to continue in present position
 - b. Hope to be promoted within the same school system
 - c. Expect to seek same type position now held but in larger system
 - d. Expect to seek same type position now held but in another system of same size or smaller
 - e. Expect to retire within two years
 - f. Expect to leave public education employment
 - g. Other. Specify: _____

27. What would you like your next position to be?
- | | |
|--|---|
| a. <input type="checkbox"/> Superintendent | e. <input type="checkbox"/> Principal |
| b. <input type="checkbox"/> Associate Superintendenc | f. <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Principal |
| c. <input type="checkbox"/> Assistant Superintendent | g. <input type="checkbox"/> Professor |
| d. <input type="checkbox"/> Director of Instruction | h. <input type="checkbox"/> Other. Specify: _____ |
-
28. What do you think would improve the professional advancement of women in administrative positions in education?
- a. Obtaining advanced training
 - b. Persistence in applying for administrative positions
 - c. Equal consideration with men for available positions
 - d. Willingness of school boards to hire women administrators
 - e. Having a mentor
 - f. Networking
 - g. Attitude change by women concerning their own capabilities
 - h. Passage of federal and state legislation requiring equal opportunities for men and women
 - i. Political pressures by women's groups
 - j. Patience for allowing time to bring changes in opportunities
 - k. Other Specify: _____

APPENDIX B
LETTER TO ADMINISTRATORS

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
AT GREENSBORO



School of Education

September 20, 1989

Dear Educator:

The position you occupy in the central office of your administrative unit is an important one. As a doctoral candidate in the School of Education at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, with Dr. Harold Snyder as advisor, I am constructing a profile analysis of women administrators in central office positions in this state. I believe the study will give a realistic picture of the professional background, career patterns, and attitudes evident in this vital group of educational administrators.

The purpose of this study is (1) to determine precisely the positions held by women; (2) to determine how the women acquired the positions they hold; (3) to determine the role they have in administering North Carolina's school systems; and (4) to determine the future plans of these women. This study has been endorsed by the Human Subjects Review Committee, UNCG.

In order to collect these data, I would appreciate your completion of the enclosed questionnaire and returning it to me in the stamped, self-addressed envelope by October 6th. No one will be identified by name or administrative unit/school system. The data sheets have been numbered for the sole purpose of sending reminders to non-respondents.

Your cooperation and assistance will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Josiane L. Laumann

JLL:erh

GREENSBORO, NORTH CAROLINA / 27412-5001

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA is composed of the sixteen public senior institutions in North Carolina

APPENDIX C
TABLE OF RANDOM NUMBERS

A LIST OF THE NUMBERS TAKEN FROM THE TABLE OF RANDOM
NUMBERS TO SELECT THE 200 SCHOOL PRINCIPALS
TO BE SURVEYED IN NORTH CAROLINA

Line/Col.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
56	16631	35006	85900	98275	32388	52390	16815	69298	82732	38480	73817	32523	41961	44437
57	96773	20206	42559	78985	05300	22164	24369	54224	35083	19687	11052	91491	60383	19746
58	38935	64202	14349	82674	66523	44133	00697	35552	35970	19124	63318	29686	03387	59846
59	31624	76384	17403	53363	44167	64486	64758	75366	76554	31601	12614	33072	60332	92325
60	78919	19474	23632	27889	47914	02584	37680	20801	72152	39339	34806	08930	85001	87820
61	03931	33309	57047	74211	63445	17361	62825	39908	05607	91284	68833	25570	38818	46920
62	74426	33278	43972	10119	89917	15665	52872	73823	73144	88662	88970	74492	51805	99378
63	09066	00903	20795	95452	92648	45454	09552	88815	16553	51125	79375	97596	16296	66092
64	42238	12426	87025	14267	20979	04508	64535	31355	86064	29472	47689	05974	52468	16834
65	16153	08002	26504	41744	81959	65642	74240	56302	00033	67107	77510	70625	28725	34191
66	21457	40742	29820	96783	29400	21840	15035	34537	33310	06116	95240	15957	16572	06004
67	21581	57802	02050	89728	17937	37621	47075	42080	97403	48626	68995	43805	33386	21597
68	55612	78095	83197	33732	05810	24813	86902	60397	16489	03264	88525	42786	05269	92532
69	44657	66999	99324	51281	84463	60563	79312	93454	68876	25471	93911	25650	12682	73572
70	91340	84979	46949	81973	37949	61023	43997	15263	80644	43942	89203	71795	99533	50501
71	91227	21199	31935	27022	84067	05462	35216	14486	29891	68607	41867	14951	91696	85065
72	50001	38140	66321	19924	72163	09538	12151	06878	91903	18749	34405	56087	82790	70925
73	65390	05224	72958	28609	81406	39147	25549	48542	42627	45233	57202	94617	23772	07896
74	27504	96131	83944	41575	10573	08619	64482	73923	36152	05184	94142	25299	84387	34925
75	37169	94851	39117	89632	00959	16487	65536	49071	39782	17095	02330	74301	00275	48280
76	11508	70225	51111	38351	19444	66499	71945	05422	13442	78675	84081	66938	93654	59894
77	37449	30362	06694	54690	04052	53115	62757	95348	78662	11163	81651	50245	34971	52924
78	46515	70331	85922	38329	57015	15765	97161	17869	45349	61796	66345	81073	49106	79860
79	30986	81223	42416	58353	21532	30502	32305	86482	05174	07901	54339	58861	74818	46942
80	63798	64995	46583	09785	44160	78128	83991	42865	92520	83531	80377	35909	81250	54238

Line/Col.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
81	82486	84846	99254	67632	43218	50076	21361	64816	51202	88124	41870	52689	51275	83556
82	21885	32906	92431	09060	64297	51674	64126	62570	26123	05155	59194	52799	28225	85762
83	60336	98782	07408	53458	13564	59089	26445	29789	85205	41001	12535	12133	14645	23541
84	43937	46891	24010	25560	86355	33941	25786	54990	71899	15475	95434	98227	21824	19585
85	97656	63175	89303	16275	07100	92063	21942	18611	47348	20203	18534	03862	78095	50136
86	03299	01221	05418	38982	55758	92237	26759	86367	21216	98442	08303	56613	91511	75928
87	79626	06486	03574	17668	07785	76020	79924	25651	83325	88428	85076	72811	22717	50585
88	85636	68335	47539	03129	65651	11977	02510	26113	99447	68645	34327	15152	55230	93448
89	18039	14367	61337	06177	12143	46609	32989	74014	64708	00533	35398	58408	13261	47908
90	08362	15656	60627	36478	55648	16764	53412	09013	07832	41574	17639	82163	60859	75567
91	79556	29068	04142	16268	15387	12856	66227	38358	22478	73373	88732	09443	82558	05250
92	92608	82674	27072	32534	17075	27698	98204	63863	11951	34648	88022	56148	34925	57031
93	23982	25835	40055	67006	12293	02753	14827	23235	35071	99704	37543	11601	35503	85171
94	09915	96306	05908	97901	28395	14186	00821	80703	70426	75647	76310	88717	37890	40129
95	59037	33300	26695	62247	69927	76123	50842	43834	86654	70959	79725	93872	28117	19233
96	42488	78077	69882	61657	34136	79180	97526	43092	04098	73571	80799	76536	71255	64239
97	46764	86273	63003	93017	31204	36692	40202	35275	57306	55543	53203	18098	47625	88684
98	03237	45430	55417	63282	90816	17349	88298	90183	36600	78406	06216	95787	42579	90730
99	86591	81482	52667	61582	14972	90053	89534	76036	49199	43716	97548	04379	46370	28672
100	38534	01715	94964	87288	65680	43772	39560	12918	86537	62738	19636	51132	25739	56947

Line/Col.	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)	(14)
26	81525	72295	04839	96423	24878	82651	66566	14778	76797	14780	13300	87074	79666	95725
27	29676	20591	68086	26432	46901	20849	89768	81536	86645	12659	92259	57102	80428	25280
28	00742	57392	39064	66432	84673	40027	32832	61362	98947	96067	64760	64584	96096	98253
29	05366	04213	25669	26422	44407	44048	37937	63904	45766	66134	75470	66520	34693	90449
30	91921	26418	64117	94305	26766	25940	39972	22209	71500	64568	91402	42416	07844	69618
31	00582	04711	87917	77341	42206	35126	74087	99547	81817	42607	43808	76655	62028	76630
32	00725	69884	62797	56170	86324	88072	76222	36086	84637	93161	76038	65855	77919	88006
33	69011	65795	95876	55293	18988	27354	26575	08625	40801	59920	29841	80150	12777	48501
34	25976	57948	29888	88604	67917	48708	18912	82271	65424	69774	33611	54262	85963	03547
35	09763	83473	73577	12908	30883	18317	28290	35797	05998	41688	34952	37888	38917	88050
36	91567	42595	27958	30134	04024	86385	29880	99730	55536	84855	29080	09250	79656	73211
37	17955	56349	90999	49127	20044	59931	06115	20542	18059	02008	73708	83517	36103	42791
38	46503	18584	18845	49618	02304	51038	20655	58727	28168	15475	56942	53389	20562	87338
39	92157	89634	94824	78171	84610	82834	09922	25417	44137	48413	25555	21246	35509	20468
40	14577	62765	35605	81263	39667	47358	56873	56307	61607	49518	89656	20103	77490	18062
41	98427	07523	33362	64270	01638	92477	66969	98420	04880	45585	46565	04102	46880	45709
42	34914	63976	88720	82765	34476	17032	87589	40836	32427	70002	70663	88863	77775	69348
43	70060	28277	39475	46473	23219	53416	94970	25832	69975	94884	19661	72828	00102	66794
44	53976	54914	06990	67245	68350	82948	11398	42878	80287	88267	47363	46634	06541	97809
45	76072	29515	40980	07391	58745	25774	22987	80059	39911	96189	41151	14222	60697	59583
46	90725	52210	83974	29992	65831	38857	50490	83765	55657	14361	31720	57375	56228	41546
47	64364	67412	33339	31926	14883	24413	59744	92351	97473	89286	35931	04110	23726	51900
48	08962	00358	31662	25388	61642	34072	81249	35648	56891	69352	48373	45578	78547	81788
49	95012	68379	93526	70765	10592	04542	76463	54328	02349	17247	28865	14777	62730	92277
50	15664	10493	20492	38391	91132	21999	59516	81652	27195	48223	46751	22923	32261	85653
51	16408	81899	04153	53381	79401	21438	83035	92350	36693	31238	59649	91754	72772	02338
52	18629	81953	05520	91962	04739	13092	97662	24822	94730	06496	35090	04822	86774	98289
53	73115	35101	47498	87637	99016	71060	88824	71013	18735	20286	23153	72924	35165	43040
54	57491	16703	23167	49323	45021	33132	12544	41035	80780	45393	44812	12515	98931	91202
55	30405	83946	23792	14422	15059	45799	22716	19792	09983	74353	68668	30429	70735	25499

APPENDIX D
LISTING OF NORTH CAROLINA SCHOOL UNITS
USED FOR RANDOM SAMPLE

List of North Carolina School Units Used for Random Sample

North Carolina School Units--City

Burlington City
*Washington City
*Asheville City
Kannapolis City
Hickory City
Newton-Conover City
Kings Mountain City
Shelby City
*Whiteville City
*Lexington City
*Thomasville City
*Durham City
Tarboro City
Franklinton City
Greensboro City (served as pilot)
*High Point City
*Roanoke Rapids City
*Weldon City
Hendersonville City
*Mooresville City
*Statesville City
Kinston City
*Rocky Mount City
*Chapel Hill/Carrboro City
*Elizabeth City/Pasquotank
*Asheboro City
Fairmont City
*Lumberton City
*Red Springs City
*St. Paul's City
Eden City
Western Rockingham City
Reidsville City
Salisbury City
*Clinton City
Albemarle City
Elkin City
Mount Airy City
Monroe City
Goldsboro City

North Carolina School Units--County

Alamance
*Alexander
Alleghany
Anson
Ashe
Avery
Beaufort
Bertie
Bladen
Brunswick
Buncombe
*Burke
Cabarrus
Caldwell
*Camden
*Carteret
Caswell
Catawba
Chatham
*Cherokee
Edenton/Chowan
*Clay
Cleveland
*Columbus
*New Bern/Craven
Cumberland
Currituck
Dare
*Davidson
Davie
Duplin
*Durham
Edgecombe
*Winston-Salem/Forsyth
*Franklin
*Gaston
Gates
Graham
*Granville
Greene
*Guilford
Halifax
*Harnett
Haywood
Henderson
Hertford
Hoke
*Hyde
Iredell

Jackson
*Johnston
Jones
Lee
*Lenoir
*Lincoln
Macon
*Madison
Martin
McDowell
Charlotte/Mecklenburg
*Mitchell
*Montgomery
*Moore
*Nash
*New Hanover
*Northampton
*Onslow
*Orange
Pamlico
Pender
*Perquimans
*Person
Pitt
*Polk
*Randolph
Richmond
Robeson
*Rockingham
*Rowan
*Rutherford
*Sampson
Scotland
Stanly
Stokes
Surry
*Swain
*Transylvania
*Tyrrell
*Union
Vance
Wake
Warren
*Washington
*Watauga
Wayne
*Wilkes
*Wilson
Yadkin
Yancey

*Used in survey