

Women as Leaders in Education

SUCCEEDING DESPITE INEQUITY,
DISCRIMINATION, AND OTHER
CHALLENGES

VOLUME 2: WOMEN'S LEADERSHIP IN
CLASSROOMS, SCHOOLS, AND K-12
ADMINISTRATION

Jennifer L. Martin, Editor

Women and Careers in Management
Michele A. Paludi, Series Editor



AN IMPRINT OF ABC-CLIO, LLC
Santa Barbara, California • Denver, Colorado • Oxford, England

Copyright 2011 by ABC-CLIO, LLC

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, except for the inclusion of brief quotations in a review, without prior permission in writing from the publisher.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Women as leaders in education : succeeding despite inequity, discrimination, and other challenges / Jennifer L. Martin, editor.

p. cm. — (Women and careers in management)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-313-39169-9 (hard copy : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-0-313-39170-5 (ebook)

1. Women school administrators—United States. 2. Women college administrators—United States. 3. Sex discrimination in higher education—United States. 4. Educational leadership—United States. I. Martin, Jennifer L. II. Title. III. Series.

LC212.862.W64 2011

378.1'2082—dc22

2011009216

ISBN: 978-0-313-39169-9

EISBN: 978-0-313-39170-5

15 14 13 12 11 1 2 3 4 5

This book is also available on the World Wide Web as an eBook.

Visit www.abc-clio.com for details.

Praeger

An Imprint of ABC-CLIO, LLC

ABC-CLIO, LLC

130 Cremona Drive, P.O. Box 1911

Santa Barbara, California 93116-1911

This book is printed on acid-free paper 

Manufactured in the United States of America

Contents

Series Foreword, vii

Acknowledgments, ix

Introduction, xi

CHAPTER 1

Toward a Conceptual Model of Feminist Leadership in American Education, 1

Jennifer L. Martin

CHAPTER 2

From Rags to the Riches of Radcliffe: A Historical Study of Female Graduate Leaders from Poor and Working-class Backgrounds, 37

Jennifer O'Connor

CHAPTER 3

Shirking the Maternal Shroud: A Call to Arms in Reinscribing Women Compositionists and Their Feminist Classrooms, 57

Rachel Grimshaw

CHAPTER 4

Whose Social Justice Counts? Addressing Issues of Social Justice and Equity in Schools, 75

Christa Boske

vi Contents

CHAPTER 5

Teacher Leaders Working for Social Justice: Contributing to the Field, 101

Jennifer L. Martin

CHAPTER 6

Course Guides, Equity, and Achievement: The Shaping of Student Status, 131

Lisa P. Hallen and Elizabeth J. Allan

CHAPTER 7

The Risks of Sex-Segregated Public Education for Girls, Boys, and Everyone, 155

Susan S. Klein

CHAPTER 8

Understanding Gender-Based Leadership Learning Behaviors, 195

Shannon R. Flumerfelt, Lindson Feun, and C. Robert Maxfield

CHAPTER 9

Women in Administration: Differences in Equity, 221

Marjorie Ringler, Cheryl McFadden, and Valjeaner Ford

CHAPTER 10

Women Leaders as Superintendents: Stories of Courage and Character, 245

Deb Clarke

CHAPTER 11

This I Believe: Teaching in Color, 269

Carmen M. Johnson

CHAPTER 12

Both Sides of Mentoring: A Leader's Story, 279

Lynn Kleiman Malinoff and James E. Barott

About the Editor and Contributors, 319

Index, 329

9

Women in Administration: Differences in Equity

Marjorie Ringler, Cheryl McFadden, and Valjeaner Ford

Introduction

Discriminations based on gender, ethnicity, and sex-role stereotypes in education are common within bureaucratic school governance (Benjamin, 2004). In the early 1900s, women were kept out of administrative roles because the belief in male dominance made it easy to accept that men were leaders and women were natural followers. A look at the number of women in school administration since 1905 illustrates consistent male dominance in all positions except for in the elementary school (Shakeshaft, 1989). According to Shakeshaft, "by 1928, women held 55 percent of the elementary principalships, 25 percent of the county superintendencies, nearly 8 percent of the secondary school principalships, and 1.6 percent of the district superintendencies" (p. 34). Although at first glance, these statistics seem significant, the jobs were lower paying, lower status, and lower power positions than the ones held by men.

Compounding gender inequities are the racial inequities among males and females and the larger population of adults in the job market. There are many issues that affect the educational attainment among ethnic minorities that will impact their attainment in school leadership. This chapter will discuss gender, ethnic, and salary differences in school administration. In addition, this chapter will discuss how principal preparation programs affect the inequities present among school administrators. To do so, this

chapter discusses a study of faculty in principal preparation programs that disaggregated data based on gender and ethnicity. The data analysis draws comparisons to national trends and the findings reveal compelling results that indicate that even though there has been progress in increasing the number of women in positions of academia, there is still much work to be done in equalizing salaries for women and in diversifying the faculty ethnicity.

Women in School Administration

While studies of women and their leadership in schools continue to be limited in comparison to studies of men, information does exist about women who have broken through the “glass ceiling” of school administration, and these facts and figures reveal modest representation of women in leadership roles (Restine, 1993). Sustained increases seem promising due to progressively increasing percentages of women making up the ranks of future administrators seeking graduate degrees in leadership preparation programs (Hill & Ragland, 1995). According to Gupton and Slick (1996), “women received 11 percent of the doctoral degrees in educational administration in 1972, 20 percent in 1980, 39 percent in 1982, and 51 percent in 1990” (p. 136). As a result, the numbers and percentages of women in administrative positions have increased, beginning slowly in the 1970s and accelerating in the 1980s (McFadden & Smith, 2004).

Myths about women’s leadership abilities continue to be significant aspects in the selection of school administrators (Restine, 1993). Women often are encumbered by distorted images and stereotypes such as “icy virgins, fiery temptresses, and silent martyrs” (Hill & Ragland, 1995, p. 7). In addition, negative connotations are associated with the prefix *woman*. Witmer (2006) describes “woman’s work” as housekeeping and “women’s intuition” as guessing rather than knowing. The need for competent educational leaders demands that these stereotypical images be discarded and leaders sought from all segments of society (Hill & Ragland).

Another important barrier to women in administration is gender-role or cultural stereotyping (Harris, Ballenger, Hicks-Townes, Carr, & Alford, 2004; Hill & Ragland, 1995; Regan & Brooks, 1995; Restine, 1993; Shakeshaft, 1989). It tends to place women in nonleadership roles that limit their goal orientation and inhibit their ability to recognize their

ability to lead (Harris et al., 2004). Another explanation is that women aspire to achieve in the career they choose initially—teaching, and do not want to become principals (Shakeshaft, 1989). They do not seek administrative positions because they do not view themselves in positions of leadership (Gupton & Slick, 1996). According to Gupton and Slick, “administration in public education is male dominated and generally accepted as such by both males and females” (p. 147).

A study by Thompson (2000) directly contrasted the stereotypical assertions in earlier research by revealing no differences in the perceived effectiveness of leaders regarding gender. His accumulated findings demonstrate that “the broad differences in leadership styles in relation to gender and leadership effectiveness have clear implications for our understanding of how effective managers behave” (Thompson, p. 985). A new appreciation, new understanding, and greater empathy for this group will be gained by reexamining the experiences of women and acknowledging the importance of their leadership abilities (Schwartz, 1997).

Another study by Papa-Lewis (1987) focused on respondents’ perceptions of selected intrinsic and extrinsic variables and access differences on these variables by gender. Intrinsic factors are psychological in nature and are aspects of the personality, values, and attitudes of the individual (aspiration level, sex-role stereotyping, lack of confidence and initiative, family or self-imposed constraints, low self-image, and negative perception of advancement opportunities). Extrinsic factors are those environmental factors that may mediate entrance into the administrative hierarchy (informal socialization and selection systems, sex-role stereotyping, sex/race/age discrimination, lack of role models/sponsors, lack of networks, lack of support for opposition to sex-equity policies, and lack of enforcement of Title IX mandates). The study used a fifty-six-item questionnaire to obtain results of trends. The results indicated that there were no significant differences between women and men and black and white. The study found very little evidence proving that there are intrinsic factors that keep minorities and women from entering education administration. So it is believed that extrinsic factors are playing a role in the lack of women and minorities in those positions.

In order to understand the differences in gender in school administration, it is important to understand the trends that exist in the demographics present in the United States and how they impact public schools.

Changing Diversity in the United States

The U.S. population consisted of a Caucasian majority from the 1900s to 1960s with the significant minority population of African Americans at 12 percent and all other minorities amounting to 4 percent of the remaining minority population (Tienda & Mitchell, 2006). Since the 1960s, due to immigration and fertility patterns, the U.S. population has exhibited drastic changes in diversity, with the Caucasian majority decreasing, the African American minority remaining stable in numbers, and the Hispanic minority increasing in fast increments. Between the years 2000 and 2007, the percent change of Caucasians (2.1%) and African American (8.7%) has not been as drastic as 50.4 percent of Hispanics both born in the United States (31%) and immigrant to the United States (19.4%; Fry, 2007). According to the Pew Hispanic Center, the number of Hispanics is expected to continue its rapid growth. The projected number of immigrants' children will increase from 12.3 million in 2005 to 17.9 million in 2020 (Fry, 2008). This projected growth is the overall expected enrollment growth in public schools.

The education pipeline that develops minority children into school administrators has many breaks in its path. It is important to discuss the reasons why many minorities are not graduating from high school qualified to continue their education at universities. Reasons for educational attainment are many that can be traced to challenges present before entering public schools and that are present throughout K-12 education. The many reasons are described in the next section.

Ethnic Diversity in Public Schools

The change in ethnic demographics in the United States is also reflected in the public schools. The average rate of growth of the Hispanic population enrolled in public schools between the years 1993 and 2006 has increased by more than 55 percent, comprising 19.8 percent of students, up 12.7 percent (Fry, 2007). The growing number of Hispanics in schools has increased the number of students who are likely to be English language learners (ELLs). In 1990, 32 million people in the United States over the age of five spoke a language other than English in their homes, comprising 14 percent of the total U.S. population. By 2000, that number had risen by 47 percent to nearly 47 million, comprising nearly 18 percent of the total U.S. population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006). Nationally, the number of ELLs in public

schools increased from approximately 2 million students in 1993 to 1994 to 3 million students in 1999 to 2000 (Meyer, Madden, & McGrath, 2005). The fact that these students have limited English proficiency poses a learning challenge for students in that not only are they learning a second language but they also need to learn their academics in this second language (Short & Echevarria, 2005; Tienda, 2009).

Gaps in Education

The educational trends among ethnic groups indicate an increasing gap between educational attainment levels of Caucasians, African Americans, Asians, and Hispanics as determined by graduation rates. From 1970 to 2006, the high school and college graduation rates among the four ethnic groups have steadily increased (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006). However, the percentages are daunting among college graduates. By 2006, only 17 percent of African Americans age twenty-five and above completed college degrees, yet with the steady rate of population growth of this ethnic group, the number is not as impacting as is the fact that only 12 percent of similarly aged Hispanics graduated from college (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006). Asians of age twenty-five or above had the highest number of college graduates at 49 percent, but Asians represent a low percentage of the U.S. population, in contrast to Caucasians with 30 percent graduating from college.

Socially, many of the Hispanic families who are moving into the United States come from low-socioeconomic backgrounds and work earnestly in the United States performing unskilled labor. This could be one reason for the educational gap; however, many of the Hispanic immigrants have children who are United States born and have attended school since kindergarten. Several reasons for the lack of educational attainment could be attributed to the parents' literacy levels, parents' educational attainment, and parental value of education, among many others. Many of these factors are beyond the scope and influence of public school systems. It is important, however, to discuss the ethnic diversity among school teachers and principals as they serve as role models to children in schools.

Lack of Role Models

Having a teaching force reflective of the diversity among the student population has the benefit of providing minority students opportunities to be

exposed to a diversity of successful role models. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2007), the percentage of teachers who are Caucasian is 84.4 percent, while the percentage of students is 60.3 percent. The percentage of African American teachers is 8.3 percent in comparison to 16.8 percent of the student population. Hispanics represent only 5.7 percent of our teachers but make up 17.7 percent of students. Asians comprise 1.3 percent of teachers and 3.9 percent of students. American Indians represent only .4 percent of teachers and 1.3 percent of students. Teachers of diverse backgrounds also benefit students' education attainment with their awareness of their students' cultures and the ability to build on their students' background experiences to bridge the gap between the school, the home, and the community and learning academics.

Principals are role models as well. Similar to teachers, principals have a great influence in the schooling of the changing diverse student population. The diversity trend among principals in the U.S. reflects the lack of diversity and the need to increase minorities in positions of school leadership. In 2003 to 2004, 82 percent of all school principals were Caucasian, 11 percent were African American, 5 percent Hispanic, and 1 percent American Indian/Alaska Native. The overwhelming majority of principals are Caucasians serving in schools with diverse student populations. Salaries among principals may also be enticing for those adults that qualify for the principalship. The average annual salary for public school principals in 2003 to 2004 was \$75,500, with high school principals making a higher salary (\$79,400) than elementary school principals (\$75,400; NCES, 2007).

Adults who become principals typically come from the teaching ranks and thus to increase the number of women and the diversity of principals we need to increase the number of female teachers who chose to continue their education to become principals. To add to this, it is important to encourage diverse teaching staff to choose the school administration path. The next section discusses the role of academia in preparing female school administrators by analyzing the equity issues that permeate academia in terms of access and salary differences.

Women in Principal Preparation Programs

Women comprise well over half of the teaching force in the United States, and administrators are drawn from the teaching force. Why, then, is there

such a discrepancy in the numbers of male and female administrators? Some reasons parallel those for minorities—the vicious cycle that depresses aspirations, the lack of access to “old boy networks,” and the denial of opportunity for support, mentoring, and coaching, but more importantly, a large and persistent gender wage gap. The gender wage gap is even larger in principal preparation programs for the female faculty who prepare teachers to enter the world of school administration (Benjamin, 2004).

The subject of gender equity is a topic that has been discussed among numerous studies in the past that date back to the 1970s and 1980s. Administrators in public schools as well as the university level have had to establish guidelines to monitor affirmative action laws to ensure equal pay among minority faculty (women and nonwhites). Other areas of concern are women in lower senior ranks as well as tenure and non-tenure-track positions. Several studies have produced evidence of salary discrimination in favor of men faculty members. Numerous studies indicate that there has been and still exists today a gender salary difference among male and female faculty members across university campuses (Benjamin, 2004).

Gender Salary Differences

As time progressed (Ashraf, 1996), several studies indicated that evidence of salary discrimination against women in academia still exists and is very prevalent today across university campuses. Yes, progress has been made in some respects; however, in some cases, complaints and investigations led to corrective measures as an endeavor to remedy pay inequities in administration and the university level. Progress has been made, but at an unacceptable rate toward the equalization of male and female salaries. There have been numerous national studies conducted to bring light to the salary discrepancies of male and female faculty. A national survey conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) indicated (Barbezat & Hughes, 2001) that male faculty had a disadvantage over female faculty, a salary gap of 27.7 percent attributed to discrimination.

Estimated results from numerous studies (Ashraf, 1996; Barbezat, 2002; Ransom & Megdal, 1993) all indicate that in the late 1980s, female faculty received more of a disadvantage than their comparable male colleagues. These findings were very disappointing, debatable, and even alarming. All of the findings, however, were not totally bleak or distressing. There was a

small decline in percentage points that was characteristic of a small decline in the salary gap. These findings, however, were not true across the board; they varied according to the type of institution as well as other variables: experience, age, academic rank, marital status, and publications.

The gender salary gap is quite complex and has no simple answer due to the many factors involved. Results of numerous studies propose that differences in salary among female and male faculty vary depending on the types of institutions such as comprehensive colleges and universities, liberal arts colleges and universities, doctoral universities and research universities (Maurer-Fazio & Hughes, 2002). Results have determined that women employed at research universities experience the gender gap in a larger capacity than women at the other three types of universities. This does not mean, however, that female or male faculty at other types of universities at comprehensive universities, doctoral universities, or liberal arts universities are advancing better in terms of faculty salary, race, and ethnicity.

More than forty years of concentration have been given to the study of sex and ethnic differences in employment status. Analyses results of the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (Brown, 1997) results show that women represented only 28 percent of full-time tenured faculty but 44 percent of full-time faculty who were on a tenure track and as high as 45 percent of full-time faculty who were not on a tenure track. Startling statistics also indicate that only 20 percent of full-time professors were women, 34 percent were associate professors, 45 percent were assistant professors, and a high 51 percent were full-time instructors. The results for African Americans were also very low, representing a smaller proportion of full-time tenured than full-time tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty. Even a smaller percentage of African American faculty was full-time professors than full-time assistant professors. Furthermore, Hispanics and other minority faculty represented only 3 percent of full-time tenured faculty (Perna, 2001).

Studies over the years have shown that women faculty and women faculty of various ethnicities hold lower ranks than male faculty when taking into account other variables such as educational achievement, experience, and institutional characteristics as well as one's academic discipline (Toutkoushian, 1999). It has thus been determined that women full-time faculty were less likely than men to advance to tenured positions at the rank of full professor, but at the same time it has also been determined that

women were as likely as men to advance to associate professor. Research further suggests that different criteria are often applied in promotion and tenure decisions for women than for men and that African Americans were less likely than whites to hold tenured positions (Perna, 2001). A common thread that runs through most of the studies of gender and other ethnicities is evidence of wage discrimination against women in higher education at the college and university level.

Ethnicity among Higher Education Faculty

Faculty at higher education institutions are not representative of the diversity present in the U.S. populations. According to the NCES (2009), in fall 2007, minority faculty composed 17 percent of the higher education faculty in the United States. Of these 17 percent, 7 percent were African American, 6 percent were Asian/Pacific Islander, 4 percent were Hispanic, and 1 percent was American Indian/Alaska Native. The remaining 83 percent of faculty were Caucasian. Thus, the majority of college campuses are predominately Caucasian, sending a message to students entering postsecondary education that jobs in higher education are more attainable for those who are Caucasian.

Salaries in higher education may be an enticing factor to increase recruitment of minorities as instructional faculty at higher education institutions. Based on nine-month average salaries at Title IV degree-granting institutions, the NCES (2009) reports that assistant professors earn an average of \$59,283, associate professors earn an average of \$70,744, and professors earn an average of \$98,020. These are enticing salaries for qualified adults. The issue is that many minorities are not graduating from high school qualified to continue their education at universities (Tienda, 2009). Reasons for educational attainment are many that can be traced to socioeconomic challenges present before entering public schools and were explained earlier in this chapter.

The analysis of gender inequities in higher education and administration provides valuable insight to differences in salaries and roles of women. Salaries in academia and school administration are enticing to women and minorities; however, as described in this chapter, there are many socioeconomic factors that play a role in selecting administration and academia as careers. The next section presents a major study conducted in the

230 Women as Leaders in Education

University of North Carolina (UNC) system that analyzed current faculty salaries in educational leadership programs to determine whether there are salary inequities by gender and ethnicity.

Study Design and Methodology

The purpose of this study was to compare differences in equity among faculty in educational leadership programs in the University of North Carolina (UNC) system. This study examined several demographic variables among the faculty: gender, ethnicity, tenure, rank (assistant, associate, and professor) and salary. Our research hypotheses included:

1. There will be a greater percentage of male faculty than female faculty in educational leadership programs.
2. Female faculty will have lower salaries than male faculty in educational leadership programs.
3. Female faculty will have lower salaries than male faculty at all three levels of rank in educational leadership programs.
4. Minority faculty will have lower salaries than Caucasian faculty in educational leadership programs.

Data Collection

After obtaining Institutional Review Board approval, we contacted the University of North Carolina General Administration and requested a copy of all the 2008 to 2009 salaries in the UNC system. It should be noted that these salaries are for nine months of employment. We contacted the chairs of departments of educational leadership and/or office personnel at the eleven institutions and obtained the gender, ethnicity, rank, and tenure status.

Participants

Data for one hundred twenty-five faculty from eleven institutions within the University of North Carolina System were analyzed in this study. The institutions that participated included: East Carolina University (ECU), Fayetteville State University (FSU), North Carolina State University (NCSU), University of North Carolina–Chapel Hill (UNC–CH),

University of North Carolina–Charlotte (UNC–C), University of North Carolina–Wilmington (UNC–W), Western Carolina University (WCU), the University of North Carolina–Greensboro (UNC–G), North Carolina A&T (NC A&T), Appalachian State (App State), and University of North Carolina–Pembroke (UNC–P).

Results

Demographics

Overall out of 125 faculty, 38.4 percent of the faculty are females and 61.6 percent are males. The ethnicity of 122 faculty is as follows: 75.4 percent of the faculty are Caucasian, 19.7 percent African American, 4 percent Asian, and 0.8 percent Hispanic. Out of 122 faculty, 53.3 percent of the faculty are tenured and 46.7 percent are tenure track. Rank of 124 faculty is as follows: 41.1 percent are assistant professors, 24.2 percent are associate professors, and 34.7 percent are professors (see Table 9.1).

Demographic information is presented for each institution in Table 9.2. Only the UNC–CH and the WCU have more women than men faculty. Only FSU (a historically African American university) has more minority than Caucasian faculty, although it has no female faculty in the education leadership department. The institution with the greatest disparity in salary between females and males is the NC A&T (153%), then UNC–C (31%), followed by the UNC–CH (29.9%), UNC–W (27.6%), NCSU (22.8%), App State (22%), ECU (14.5%), WCU (7.1%), and UNC–G (6.7%), where the average male salary is larger than the female salary. UNC–P is the only institution where as an average females make more than males by 13 percent, and this is due to one faculty member who is also an associate dean.

Data Analysis

It was important to analyze the salary data according to gender, ethnicity, tenure status, and rank for all eleven institutions. The average salary for females is \$74,586 and for males, \$85,840, a difference of 15 percent. The average salary for minority faculty is \$78,156 while for Caucasian faculty is \$82,502. The average salary for female tenured faculty is \$85,267 and for male tenured faculty, \$98,902, a difference of 15.9 percent. The difference between female (\$66,675) and male (\$65,121)

TABLE 9.1
Demographics of Department of Educational Leadership Faculty for all Institutions

Gender <i>n</i> = 125		Ethnicity <i>n</i> = 125				Tenure Status <i>n</i> = 125		Rank <i>n</i> = 125		
Female	Male	Caucasian	AA	Hispanic	Asian	Tenured	Tenured Track	Asst	Assoc	Prof
38.4%	61.6%	76%	19.2%	0.008%	0.04%	52.8%	47.2%	41.6%	24%	34.4%
(48)	(77)	(95)	(24)	(1)	(5)	(66)	(59)	(52)	(30)	(43)

Note. AA = African American.

TABLE 9.2
Demographics of Department of Educational Leadership Faculty by Institution

Institution	Rank				Average Salary				
	% Female	% Male	%		% Minority	% Tenured	% Tenured Track	F	M
ECU n = 18	38	61	22	Asst	27	66	33	\$81,694	\$93,574
			50	Assoc					
			27	Prof					
FSU n = 6	0	100	50	Asst	66	33	66	—	\$80,138
			16	Assoc					
			33	Prof					
NCSU n = 8	25	75	50	Asst	12	50	50	\$76,861	\$94,454
			37	Assoc					
			12	Prof					
UNC-CH n = 5	60	40	0	Asst	40	80	20	\$110,059	\$143,046
			20	Assoc					
			80	Prof					

(continued)

Table 9.2 (continued)

Institution	Rank				Average Salary				
	% Female	% Male	%		% Minority	% Tenured	% Tenured Track	F	M
UNC-C n = 19	42	55	47	Asst	26	47	52	\$66,387	\$86,970
			10	Assoc					
			10	Prof					
UNC-W n = 11	27	72	72	Asst	18	18	81	\$60,369	\$77,113
			9	Assoc					
			18	Prof					
WCU n = 10	60	40	40	Asst	0	30	70	\$70,360	\$75,417
			30	Assoc					
			30	Prof					
UNC-G n = 10	40	60	40	Asst	20	60	40	\$82,443	\$88,005
			20	Assoc					
			40	Prof					
NC A&T n = 3	67	33	33	Asst	100	67	33	\$63,809	\$161,715
			33	Assoc					
			33	Prof					

App St. n = 28	36	64	36 18 46	Asst Assoc Prof	4	64	36	\$68,722	\$84,103
UNC-P n = 7	43	57	57 28 14	Asst Assoc Prof	43	57	43	\$78,209	\$65,829

tenure-track faculty is 2.3 percent, with females having the higher average salary. The average salary for female minority tenured faculty is \$71,838 and for male minority tenured faculty, \$108,288, a difference of 50.7 percent. Female Caucasian tenured faculty have an average salary of \$89,743, with male Caucasian faculty being paid \$96,911, a difference of 7.9 percent. Interestingly, female minority tenure-track faculty have an average salary of \$65,933, with male minority tenure-track salary being \$61,486, a difference of 7.2 percent. There is a 1 percent difference between female and male Caucasian tenure-track faculty, with female faculty earning slightly more than male faculty.

Female faculty have lower average salaries than male faculty at all three levels of rank, with the greatest difference being at the professor level (see Table 9.3). The difference at the assistant professor level between female (\$63,588) and male (\$65,425) is less than 3 percent. Female associate professors have a 2.7 percent lower average salary than males of similar rank. The difference between the female (\$100,427) and male faculty (\$102,778) at the professor level is 2.3 percent. However, there is a 6.6 percent difference between female minority assistant professors and male minority assistant professors, with females having the higher average salary. There is a significant difference (22%) in average salary between female minority professors (\$98,531) and male minority professors (\$120,339).

Findings

The purpose of this study was to compare differences in equity among faculty in educational leadership programs in the UNC System. We have presented our findings for each hypothesis.

There will be a Greater Percentage of Male Faculty than Female Faculty in Educational Leadership Programs

There are 60.4 percent more male than female faculty in educational leadership programs in the eleven institutions within the UNC System. Although women receive 50 percent of the graduate degrees in the United States and specifically 51 percent are in educational administration, this trend is clearly not evident in the UNC system (Gupton & Slick, 1996; Mason, 2009). What is interesting to note is that although the number of females

TABLE 9.3**Salaries of Department of Educational Leadership Faculty for all Institutions**

Gender	Overall	Tenured	Tenure Track	Minority Tenured	Minority Tenure Track	Caucasian Tenured	Caucasian Tenure Track	Overall Rank		Minority Rank	
Female	\$74,586	\$85,267	\$66,675	\$71,838	\$65,933	\$89,743	\$67,046	Asst	\$63,588	Asst	\$65,855
								Assoc	\$78,643	Assoc	—
								Prof	\$100,427	Prof	\$98,531
Male	\$85,840	\$98,902	\$65,121	\$108,288	\$61,486	\$96,911	\$66,069	Asst	\$65,425	Asst	\$61,486
								Assoc	\$80,783	Assoc	\$72,408
								Prof	\$102,778	Prof	\$120,339

in K–12 administrative positions is on the rise, this trend is not crossing over to educational leadership programs at the college and university level. Is this due to the “glass ceiling” effect or are there other possible explanations?

Female Faculty Will Have Lower Salaries Than Male Faculty in Educational Leadership Programs

Female faculty earned 15 percent lower salaries than male faculty in educational leadership programs within the eleven institutions in the UNC System. In fact, female faculty in eight of the eleven institutions earned less than male faculty. One institution (FSU) does not have any female tenured or tenure-track faculty. The disparity between institutions ranges from the lowest, 6.7 percent (UNC–G), to the highest, 31 percent (UNC–C). This disparity clearly indicates the need for institutions to correct the inequity and create workplaces that attract, retain, develop, and encourage advancement of women in educational institutions (Harrington & Ladge, 2009).

This disparity continues when one examines female tenured faculty, who have 15.9 percent lower salaries than male tenured faculty. What is interesting to note is that this disparity does not continue when one examines tenure-track faculty. Apparently the disparity occurs after a female faculty member is tenured. Male faculty salaries increase at a faster pace than salaries of female faculty.

Female Faculty Will Have Lower Salaries Than Male Faculty at all Three Levels of Rank

It is therefore not surprising that female faculty have lower salaries than male faculty at all three levels of rank. Again, the disparity does not occur at the assistant tenure-track level but at the associate tenured level. Amazingly, this disparity is relatively low (2.1%) at the professor level. What will be interesting to see is if this disparity will continue when these females at the associate level reach the professor level.

Minority Faculty Will Have Lower Salaries Than Caucasian Faculty in Educational Leadership Programs

When we analyzed the data on minority faculty, we were not surprised to discover that minority faculty earn less (5.5%) than Caucasian faculty. We

were however, surprised at several other findings. First, while female minority faculty earn 29 percent lower salaries than male minority faculty, overall this disparity discontinues at the tenure track level. Female minority faculty at the tenure-track level earn 7.2 percent greater salaries than male minority faculty at the same level. Second, female minority faculty have 7.1 percent higher salaries than male minority faculty at the assistant professor level. However, this difference is reversed at the professor level, where male minority faculty have 22.1 percent higher salaries than female minority professors. Why do female minority assistant professors earn more than male minority assistant professors and why is this disparity reversed at the professor level? One possible explanation could be that in order to recruit minority faculty, schools need to offer competitive salaries, and female minority faculty command higher salaries. Once in the system, female minority faculty do not progress through the ranks at the level of male minority faculty due to similar reasons (glass ceiling effect) their Caucasian counterparts do not.

Implications for Women in School Administration

Need to Increase Women in School Administration

Even though the number of female graduates from principal preparation programs is steadily increasing, the trend is not evident in the number of women who are faculty in principal preparation programs. It is important to have role models for school administrators that are similar to the student body. Therefore, university systems should develop strategic plans in collaboration with school districts to institute programs that promote teacher leadership, resulting in teachers entering school administration. A long-range plan for this partnership should include the increase of number of women that enter academia as professors of educational leadership.

Need to Decrease Salary Differentials

The salary gap between men and women in administration and academia persists. In addition, this gap widens when analyzing the gaps by gender and ethnicity. Even though school districts typically have a salary system based on years of experience, it is important to modify the salary system to allow for additional factors that impact women more than men such

as sex-role stereotyping, constraints imposed by self and family, lack of confidence, and lack of sponsors/mentors. A strategic and effective approach is to institute a mentoring plan upon entering the teaching profession that focuses on more than just becoming a better teacher. The mentoring should also focus on building leadership skills, enhancing confidence, and flexibility to accommodate family commitments. The salary system should allow for the factors of the mentoring process and treat both men and women equitably.

Decrease Ethnic Differentials

The ethnicity gap is perhaps larger than the gender gap in terms of representation and salary. It is important to institute a systemic approach that encourages minority children to not only graduate but also graduate with aspirations to return to the school system as teachers and school administrators. To do so, the profession of education needs a salary overhaul. By increasing the salaries earned as educators, the profession will be able to compete with other professions that make higher salaries and therefore recruit top-quality teachers and leaders that will make a significant impact in schools. The same argument applies to principal preparation programs. It is the responsibility of higher education programs to diversify their faculty from one that is predominantly male to add more females and ethnic minority females. Therefore, universities of higher education must consider changing salary structures to offer equal opportunities for women.

Conclusion

With the changing diverse population in the United States, it is important to continue to recruit and retain teachers and principals reflective of the population changes. These two job roles are the basis for recruitment for educational leadership programs not only for program enrollment but also for faculty recruitment. Salaries commensurate with the field and the cost of living are enticing factors in recruiting faculty to teach in higher education institutions. This study reflects many inequities that still exist along gender and ethnic lines. It is therefore important to equitably recruit and pay qualified educators into the professoriate to model and educate the future of public school students in America.

References

- Ashraf, J. (1996). The influence of gender on faculty salaries in the United States, 1969–1989. *Applied Economics*, 28, 857–64.
- Barbezat, D. (2002). History of pay equity studies In R. Toutkoushian (Ed.), *Conducting salary-equity studies: Alternative approaches to research* (pp. 9–40). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Barbezat, D. & Hughes, J. (2001). The effect of job mobility on academic salaries. *Contemporary Economic Policy* 19(4), 409–23.
- Benjamin, E. (2004). *Disparities in the salaries and appointments of academic women and men: An update of a 1988 report of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Academic Profession*. Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors.
- Brown, P. Q. (1997). *Salaries of Full-Time Instructional Faculty on 9- and 10-month and 11- and 12-month contracts 1995-96*. (NCES 97416). Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics.
- Fry, R. (2007). *The changing racial and ethnic composition of U.S. public schools*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. Retrieved May 26, 2009, from <http://pewhispanic.org/reports/79.pdf>.
- Fry, R. (2008). *The role of schools in the English language learner achievement gap*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. Retrieved May 26, 2009, at <http://pewhispanic.org/files/reports/89.pdf>.
- Gupton, S. L., & Slick, G. A. (1996). *Highly successful women administrators*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Harrington, B., & Ladge, J. J. (2009). Got talent? It isn't hard to find: Recognizing and rewarding the value women create in the work place. In H. Boushey & A. O'Leary (Eds.), *The Shriver report. A women's nation changes everything* (pp. 198–231). Washington, DC: Center for American Progress. Retrieved from http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2009/10/pdf/awn/a_womans_nation.pdf.
- Harris, S., Ballenger, J., Hicks-Townes, F., Carr, C., & Alford, B. (2004). *Winning women: Stories of award-winning educators*. Lantham, MD: Scarecrow Education.
- Hill, M. S., & Ragland, J. C. (1995). *Women as educational leaders: Opening windows, pushing ceilings*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

- Mason, M. A. (2009). Better educating our new breadwinners: Creating opportunities for all women to succeed in the workforce. In H. Boushey & A. O'Leary (Eds.), *The Shriver report. A women's nation changes everything* (pp. 198–231). Washington, DC: Center for American Progress. Retrieved from http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2009/10/pdf/awn/a_womans_nation.pdf.
- Maurer-Fazio M. and Hughes, J. (2002). The effects of market liberalization on the relative earnings of Chinese women. *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 30, 709–31.
- McFadden, A. H., & Smith, P. (2004). *The social construction of educational leadership*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Meyer, D., Madden, D., & McGrath, D. J. (2005). English language learner students in U.S. public schools: 1994 and 2000. *Education Statistics Quarterly* 6(3). Retrieved September 28, 2006, from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/quarterly/vol_6/6_3/3_4.asp.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2007). *A brief profile of America's public schools* (NCES 2007-379). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2009). *Employees in postsecondary institutions, fall 2007, and salaries of full-time instructional faculty, 2007–08* (NCES 2009-154). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Papa-Lewis, R., & Leonard, P. Y. (1987). *Factors and perceptions of equal access for women and minorities in educational administration*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C. (ERIC Document and Reproduction Service No. ED 283282).
- Perna, L. (2001). Sex and race differences in faculty tenure and promotion. *Research in Higher Education*, 42(5), 541–67.
- Ransom, M., & Megdal, S. (1993). Sex differences in the academic labor market in the affirmative action era. *Economics of Education Review*, 12, 2143.
- Regan, H. B., & Brooks, G. H. (1995). *Out of women's experience: Creating relational leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

- Restine, L. N. (1993). *Women in administration: Facilitators for change*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin.
- Schwartz, R. A. (1997). Reconceptualizing the leadership roles of women in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 68(5), 502–22.
- Shakeshaft, C. (1989). *Women in educational administration*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Short, D., & Echevarria, J. (2005). Teacher skills to support English language learners. *Educational Leadership*, 62(4), 8–13.
- Tienda, M. (2009, March). *Hispanicity and educational inequality: Risks, opportunities and the nation's future*. The 25th Tomas Rivera Lecture presented at the American Association of Hispanics in Higher Education (AAHHEE). San Antonio, Texas: Educational Testing Service Evaluation and Research Center.
- Tienda, M., & Mitchell F. (2006). *Multiple origins, uncertain destinies: Hispanics and the American future*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press, U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Thompson, M. D. (2000). Gender, leadership orientations, and effectiveness: Testing the theoretical models of Bolman and Deal and Quinn. *Sex Roles*, 42(11, 12), 969–92.
- Toutkoushian, R. (1999). The status of academic women in the 1990s: No longer outsiders, but not yet equals. *Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, 39 (Special Issue, 679–98).
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2006). *Statistical abstract of the United States, 2006*. Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Witmer, J. T. (2006). *Moving up! A guidebook for women in educational administration*. Lanham, MD: Rowman Littlefield Education.