

10-2006

## Female Superintendents: Historic Barriers and Prospects for the Future

Stephen K. Miller

*University of Louisville*, [steve.miller@louisville.edu](mailto:steve.miller@louisville.edu)

Youlanda C. Washington

*Macdonald Intermediate School*, [odessaniva@aol.com](mailto:odessaniva@aol.com)

Jeanna R. Fiene

*Western Kentucky University*, [jeanne.fiene@wku.edu](mailto:jeanne.fiene@wku.edu)

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



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

---

Miller, Stephen K.; Washington, Youlanda C.; and Fiene, Jeanna R., "Female Superintendents: Historic Barriers and Prospects for the Future" (2006). *Journal of Women in Educational Leadership*. 201.

<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/jwel/201>

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

# Female Superintendents: Historic Barriers and Prospects for the Future

---

Stephen K. Miller  
Youlanda C. Washington  
Jeanne R. Fiene

This paper addresses the historic under representation of female superintendents. The primary focus is the legacy of discrimination, in which the barriers to female advancement in a traditionally male field are described. Particular attention is given to three different models of male dominance that have been developed to explain how and/or why women have been excluded from top positions in educational administration. In part two, recognition of the importance of women's contributions to evolving theory in educational administration and a description of the feminine leadership model is offered, wherein women utilize flexible web-like structures, empower others, and prioritize children and learning. In conclusion, future prospects for women in the superintendency are discussed.

## The Male-Dominated Superintendency

Women in school administration inhabit a traditionally male profession that has evolved from the male managerial, command and control model of the early 20th century. At that time, schools were organized into bureaucracies in which male principals and superintendents supervised female teachers who, in turn, organized the students (Ortiz & Marshall, 1988). The educational system parallels the traditional home. The gender structure in both domains was based on a dominant male whose legitimacy was unquestioned. Society has viewed the ideal leader as displaying forceful masculine qualities, associated with the behavior of men in formal positions of authority.

Women historically have had few employment opportunities in K-12 educational administration (Restine, 1993); the selection of a woman superintendent still remains the exception in public education. Increasingly, however, women have negotiated the male culture and expressed interest in

### About the Authors

*Stephen K. Miller*, Department of Leadership, Foundations and Human Resource Education, University of Louisville. Steve, a former junior high school science teacher, has served as both elementary and middle school principal. His research interests include organizational and school effectiveness, school reform, and accountability, all focused on equity considerations related to social class, race, gender, and special populations. He served as the Director of the Kentucky Career Ladder Commission in 1985-86 and was the recipient of the Metroversity Outstanding Instructor of Adult Learners Award in 2003-2004. email: [steve.miller@louisville.edu](mailto:steve.miller@louisville.edu)

*Youlanda C. Washington*, Principal, Macdonald Intermediate School, Fort Knox Community Schools. Youlanda is a former middle school teacher and elementary school principal. Her qualitative study of the women superintendents in Kentucky for the University of Louisville-Western Kentucky University Cooperative Doctoral Program, that won the Edgar L. Morphet Dissertation award from the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration for 2004, reflects her interest in women's studies and educational leadership. She was also a member of the first cohort of Kentucky's Minority Superintendent Internship Program. The work reported here is based on her dissertation. Email: [odessaniva@aol.com](mailto:odessaniva@aol.com)

*Jeanne R. Fiene*, Head, Department of Educational Administration, Leadership and Research, Western Kentucky University. Jeanne served as a K-12 vocal and instrumental music teacher and as a secondary mathematics teacher. She also served as a high school principal. Her research interests are the preparation of educational administrators, application of chaos theory to leadership, leadership of change in organizations, and women as leaders. Prior to entering higher education, Jeanne successfully completed two Eisenhower Grant programs focused on women in mathematics and science. She was recognized as top graduate student from the University of Missouri-Columbia in 1995 and teacher of the year at WKU in 2002. email: [Jeanne.fiene@wku.edu](mailto:Jeanne.fiene@wku.edu)

---

top administrative posts. Pavan and Robinson (1991) indicated that women are well prepared, hold the necessary certification, yet largely have been excluded from key administrative roles.

## **Purpose**

This paper addresses the historic under representation of female superintendents. The primary focus is the legacy of discrimination, in which the barriers to female advancement in a traditionally male field are described. Particular attention is given to three different models of male dominance that have been developed to explain how and/or why women have been excluded from top positions in educational administration. In part two, recognition of the importance of women's contributions to evolving theory in educational administration and a description of the feminine leadership model is offered, wherein women utilize flexible web-like structures, empower others, and prioritize children and learning. In conclusion, future prospects for women in the superintendency are discussed.

## **The Legacy of Discrimination**

Researchers and educators concur that the fact of so few female administrators stems from subtle notions of gender and leadership, as well as outright discrimination. For Sadker and Sadker (1985), gender bias reflects expectations about peoples' abilities and interests. The concept encompasses "culturally-determined cognitions, attitudes, and belief systems about females and males. Furthermore [gender bias] varies across cultures, changes through historical time and differs in terms of who makes the observations and judgments" (Worell & Remer, 1992, p. 9). Patterson (1994) indicated that white men tacitly define and legitimate the dominant culture, thereby shaping the observations and judgments of society.

Discriminatory attitudes and institutional barriers for women are prevalent. Researchers blame women's inability to advance on attributes that are not compatible with traditional leadership styles (Helgesen, 1990). Society views tough, logical, hierarchical control as necessary in leading school districts. People tend to hire people like themselves, i.e. white males hire white males (Shakeshaft, 1989). Because women remain in the minority in management circles, the male stereotype endures and hiring men is "normal" and never questioned (Powell, 1988). Women find themselves in staff rather than line positions with little chance for advancement (Pavan & Robinson, 1991). Women generally advance only through central office staff; the move to the superintendency is thwarted by the "glass ceiling" effect (Shakeshaft, 1989).

In the 2000 Study of the American Association of School Administrators, Glass reported that 13.2% of superintendents were women, the highest percentage observed during the 20th century. The greatest gains

in the 1990s were in suburban/urban districts serving 3,000-24,999 students. Female superintendents in those districts nearly tripled, from 5% in 1992 to 14.1% in 2000. These gains however, were tenuous. More than one-third of the 297 female superintendents had tenure of less than three years and 58% had served fewer than five years. Even these recent gains, are not reflected in the overall percentage of women superintendents in the last century (Blount, 1998).

### ***Models of Male Dominance***

In educational administration, a patriarchal system prevails. Dominant male administrative models create attitudinal and institutional barriers for women seeking leadership positions. These include traditional male lenses (Grogan, 1996), subtle gender stereotypes (Gupton & Slick, 1996), and socialization processes (Lougheed, 1998). Social scientists have developed three different conceptual models based on these structural and cultural factors to explain the under representation of women in leadership positions.

#### ***The Meritocracy Model***

The first model has been referred to as “the meritocracy model” (Estler, 1975), “the individual perspective” (Schmuck, 1980), “internal barriers” (Hansot & Tyack, 1981), and “person-centered explanations” (Ortiz & Marshall, 1988). Despite multiple labels, all use a psychological orientation to explain the persistent and continuing gender segregation in the profession. Women themselves are the issue: personal traits, characteristics, abilities, self-image, confidence, motivation, or aspirations. The meritocracy model “assumes that the most competent people are promoted according to their ability” (Estler, 1975, p. 370). This implies that men must be more competent than women because they are chosen more often (Dopp & Sloan, 1986). When the focus is on person-centered causation, individuals (women) are held responsible for their own problems (Schmuck, 1980). From this perspective, women are not assertive enough, don’t want the power, lack self-confidence, don’t aspire to line positions, are unwilling to play the game or work the system, and don’t apply for jobs (Tallerico & Burstyn, 1996). The emphasis on so-called internal barriers lends itself to “blaming the victim” (Ryan, 1976). Solutions are framed by correcting the defect, that is, changing the individual.

Haslett, Geis, and Carter (1992) discovered several stereotypes that interfere with women being accepted as leaders. Females are perceived as less intellectually competent and rational. Compounding the problem, it is considered inappropriate for women to display self-interest instead of

working solely for the group's success. But this sets up a classic "Catch 22." Women are considered to lack the traits of traditional male leadership; they are too centered on people, too emotionally demonstrative, and not assertive enough. Yet when women do exhibit these characteristics, they are considered too masculine, and not true to their female self. This is a true "damned if you do, damned if you don't" double bind (cf. Banks, 1995; Koonce, 1997). Thus feminine leadership traits, such as collaboration, alternative use of power, and people-and process-oriented skills, are too "soft" for leadership; women displaying forceful, traditional male traits are too flawed as females to be leaders.

These mixed messages affect mobility within the organization. Shakeshaft (1989) noted that success has been defined as upward movement in the organizational hierarchy, a traditional male viewpoint. Ortiz and Marshall (1988) found that women do not have poor self image or lack aspirations; rather female subjects directed their emphasis to the job at hand as a major source of satisfaction and self-esteem. Within this context, Hackney (1994) indicated that women's inward focus on the job, as opposed to upward mobility, is not due to a lack of aspirations, but negative conditioning and lack of validation within the organization. Hackney's study revealed feelings of isolation, being stifled and held back. These conditions "eat away" at self-confidence and self-esteem in work situations. The cumulative effect of these stereotypical messages and negative feedback was that many women gave up their aspirations of power and leadership.

Even with the lack of encouragement to seek higher positions, Bowles (1990) found that the low percentage of women employed in line positions could not be attributed to a lack of aspiration to be principal or superintendent. With the number of women who have entered and completed educational administration programs since 1980, lack of aspiration is clearly not a barrier. Utilizing the knowledge and skills of graduate work, more women than men are entering the application pool.

The inward orientation toward success and personal satisfaction many women derive from the job is consistent with the strong feminine value of child-centered advocacy. In the field of education, success and support for students is the ultimate purpose of schooling. In an era in which schooling has become highly politicized, it is not a bad thing that women are true to this fundamental value, especially when all too often the welfare of children has been betrayed by agendas driven by power and ideology (cf. Berliner & Biddle, 1995; Bracey, 2002).

### ***The Discrimination Model***

The second conceptual model explains men's and women's differential career aspirations and achievements, not as a function of different psychological pre-dispositions, but as an effect of the limited opportunities for women that accompany systemic gender bias (Tallerico & Burstyn, 1996). This "organizational perspective" (Schmuck, 1980) or "discrimination model" (Estler, 1975) turns attention from the individual to the educational system, with its complex of institutional structures, policies, and practices. The shift is from internal traits to external obstacles that hinder advancement (Tallerico & Burstyn, 1996). Hansot and Tyack (1981, p. 7) noted that, "[w]omen behave in self-limiting ways, not because they were socialized as females but because they are locked into low-power, low-visibility, dead-end jobs" such as directors, supervisors, consultants, coordinators, planners, and evaluators—roles generally not leading to the superintendency.

Wiggins and Coggins (1986) reported that women's career paths hinder progress to top administrative positions. Most females are found in elementary principalships. In contrast the route to the superintendency typically begins at the secondary level (Schmuck, 1975). According to Hansot and Tyack (1981), men are sought for line positions with direct supervisory responsibility and linkage to the external environment. Women are more likely to occupy positions that look inward to the system and that require a professional (staff) orientation rather than line supervision.

Asbury's (1993) study of Alabama public schools revealed that females perceived discrimination in hiring practices. The top three factors listed by women for not holding secondary principalships were (a) lack of interest, (b) the belief that male supervisors think females should not be high school principals, and (c) lack of experience in leadership activities. Lad (1998) indicated that few women held secondary principalships because (a) they had few role models as children and (b) the expectations for high school principals are high and become higher when the candidate is a female. The women in Lad's study reported they had been "passed over" in favor of males.

Traditional sex role structures in the home can exacerbate the problem. Demands on the secondary principal may be impossible for women with family commitments. Society is more likely to see the long hours (and concomitant neglect of family) as "ok" for men. Even when women became high school principals, they reported they had to work harder and longer to obtain evaluations equal to that of men (Napier & Willower, 1990-1991). Estler (1975) noted that such organizational structures and practices discriminate against women in educational administration.

Ortiz and Marshall (1988) elaborated: “it is organizational structures that condition women’s behaviors and attitudes in the work place” (p. 130). Tallerico and Burstyn (1996) argued that structural and systemic barriers work against the advancement of candidates who are not white males. Kanter (1977) postulated that power begets power. This works to the advantage of males when organizational leadership is dominated by men and women do not have access to the extant power base through activities and alliances. As Kanter noted, “[o]ppportunity structures shape behaviors in such a way that they confirm their own prophecies” (p. 158).

Kanter’s (1977) work on organizational mobility is relevant to the so-called lack of aspiration in women. Kanter proposed that individual organizational behavior is a function of three structural elements: opportunity, power, and relative representation. For Kanter, reduced aspiration for administrative advancement for women can be viewed as an accurate reading of true lack of opportunity. As Maienza (1986) noted, access to top administrative positions in education results from an interaction between individual behavior and organizational structures, a fundamental insight into human behavior that has been recognized for over 50 years (cf. French & Raven, 1968; Lewin, 1951).

Kanter’s (1977) work on gender generalized insights from class and race. In a major study on the effects of stratification, Sennett and Cobb (1972) used the term *protective alienation* to explicate the “negative” external locus of control that various researchers have ascribed to individuals from lower class and minority backgrounds. This belief in luck, fate, or powerful others (racism, classism) that keeps people down contrasts with an achievement-oriented internal motivational set, in which people believe their own efforts are the primary determinants of success or failure. But Stinnett and Cobb suggested the external orientation protects persons with extremely limited opportunities for success from the almost certain prospect of seeing themselves as failures if they maintain an internal causal scheme. Both reduced aspirations and an external locus of control are realistic responses to very low probabilities of beating the odds when the organization or the wider society represents an extremely uneven playing field.

A number of empirical studies produced evidence of discriminatory practices and structures that tilt the environment against females in educational administration. This evidence is consistent with Estler’s (1975) suggestion that preferential sponsoring and promotional practices explain the gender disparity in top management positions in education. Maienza (1986) concluded that three general tendencies influence mobility: (a) opportunity and power interrelate, specifically the individual’s behavior and sponsorship, (b) individuals learn to react to opportunity and power early in their careers



and those who are successful parlay these significant relationships into continued mobility, and (c) relative to men's experiences, women's career opportunities occur at lower levels of management and reflect longer tenure in lower positions before moving upward.

Hudson (1994) examined employment discrimination in practices related to job contacts. Approximately 90% of superintendents reported they learned about their jobs through some form of pre-employment assistance. White males utilized both formal job contacts and informal networks to access these positions and the individuals involved in hiring. In contrast, both women and minorities indicated that they encountered organizational restraints and territorial discrimination in seeking these jobs. Paddock (1977) noted that women were isolated by the "good ol' boy" networks which reinforced the attitudes and philosophy of school boards. These school boards, who appoint superintendents, are composed largely of men. Furthermore, Hansot and Tyack (1981) reported that male boards typically believe men to be superior candidates. Then too, many secondary principals and superintendents are former coaches who have established public reputations as leaders through these highly visible extracurricular activities.

Adding to the web of informal influence, Ryder (1994) indicated that most search consultants are former superintendents, primarily white and male, who typically hold traditional gender values. Chase and Bell (1994) found a combination of both tacit values and structures that were part of the "glass ceiling." Beliefs about men being breadwinners and an expectation for men to have higher salaries were common. More directly, search consultants reported that the primary skill sought was the ability to network successfully, a trait considered necessary for managing the often conflicting demands of the various stakeholder groups seeking to influence schools. But this represents a conundrum, seemingly unrecognized by the search consultants. Those who were perceived as most capable of networking were ensconced in the extant local and state networks of educational administration. Because these networks were part of the "good ol' boy" system of informal influence, women and minorities were at a decided disadvantage. Even if they had managed some access to these networks (and many have not), they were highly unlikely to have attained the prominence that leads to the perception of being skilled at networking.

Finally, the framework of person-organization fit theory provides one more example of how discriminatory practices in a district can work against females and minorities. Little (1998) investigated the effect of rural values on personnel selection practices in rural/small town districts in Kentucky. Universalistic hiring criteria were objective qualifications such as grade point average, experience, quality of references, and leadership. Idiosyncratic fit

related to perceptions of the “match” between the candidate’s background and the district, e.g., race, community norms, being too intelligent (can’t relate to students), or hand delivering a job application (if it was mailed, the person must be an outsider). Little found that the stronger the rural values of the hiring officials, the more likely that idiosyncratic (just like me) fit factors were utilized while universalistic criteria were discounted. Of particular relevance to the study of women in the superintendency was the not surprising result that “good ol’ boy” networks were alive and well in smaller, rural districts. Moreover, these attitudes had their negative effect on gender at the level of the superintendent. Since most teachers are female, insider versus outsider fit was the more relevant factor for teacher employment. Yet it was the insider males, not females, who were destined to climb the administrative ladder to the superintendency.

### ***The Women’s Place Model***

The third conceptual model views society as a whole, not individuals or educational systems, as the root cause of inequities (Tallerico & Burstyn, 1996). Estler (1975) refers to this as “the women’s place model,” Schmuck (1980) as “the social perspective,” and Shakeshaft (1989) as “the social structure of society.” Schmuck (1980, p. 244) explained, “[t]he folkways, norms, and mores of the society coincide with different socialization patterns and channel women and men into different areas of work, which are assigned differential pay and status.” Hansot and Tyack (1981) describe male hegemonic forces, embedded in the fabric of society and accepted without question. Androcentric bias is “viewing the world and shaping reality from a male perspective. It is the elevation of the masculine to the level of the universal and the ideal, and the honoring of men and the male principle above women and female” (Shakeshaft, 1989, p. 94). Patriarchy results, with men and women occupying different places with different rules. Estler (1975) noted that sex role values and expectations for both the organizational and institutional models are closely interrelated.

This perspective is illustrated by (a) the different ways boys and girls are enculturated, (b) the lack of female role models in positions of formal authority in general, (c) endemic differences in gender expectations, and (d) sociocultural stereotypes about “what’s ladylike” and “who looks like a leader.” For example, the balancing of career and family can be viewed as part of a much broader socio-political framework for understanding culturally defined roles. These socialization processes, by which children learn gendered behavioral expectations, have been considered a restriction to women in the field of educational administration (Restine, cited in Merle, 1999).

Whitaker and Lane (1990) pointed out that the educational system follows the model of the traditional home; men manage and women nurture the learners. Even grade levels reflect this gender segregation as females represent a much greater percentage of the teachers for primary/elementary grades compared to secondary schools where men are more commonly seen. Men are socialized to seek success outside the home, and their identity is associated with their profession. Women who teach follow the stereotyped role of nurturing and supporting others while men are expected to display the masculine traits of dominance, aggression, leadership, and autonomy.

When women do move into administrative posts, they often experience conflict between their socialized values and the more masculine demands of leadership (Curcio, Morsink, & Bridges, 1989). Several empirical studies revealed these tensions. Skrla's (1998) case study explored the conflicting social constructions of the female gender and the superintendency. Three former women superintendents talked about rules of exclusion and silence in a profession dominated by men. Traditional "male" realms such as taxes, interactions with the local business community, and especially sports were essentially off limits, i.e., these women reported they were basically considered irrelevant in these areas.

McCreight (1999) discovered that women faced barriers related to marriage and family in pursuit of the superintendency. This sex role stereotyping was evident in marital status. Males were typically married; their wives followed to a new job and set up housekeeping as usual. Women were much more likely to be single, widowed, divorced, or have commuter marriages. Men merely had to relocate and begin a new job. Women had to make alternative arrangements in their personal lives. Men had primary responsibility for their work; women were expected to retain their role as homemaker as well as being chief executive officer.

Ryder (1994) found that the traditional division of labor in the home (females take care of the household, males tend the yard and outdoor maintenance) remains unchanged in most superintendent households. A sole emphasis on professional identity conflicts with gendered expectations for women to be wife and mother (Mark, 1986), a handicap men typically do not face. This nurturing role spans the life cycle. Merle (1999) reported that women entered administration later in their careers because of their commitments to being the primary caregiver for their own children. Similarly, women more often find themselves taking the lead in elder care for parents or needy siblings, a demand that affected even single women with no children of their own.

Thus in the women's place model, discrimination exists as a reflection of societal role definitions that reinforce those expectations long after the

reasons for their existence have passed (Estler, 1975). Tallerico and Burstyn (1996) noted that this model emphasizes cultural and social norms that encourage discriminatory practices, often at a taken-for-granted, unconscious level of existence (Polanyi, 1967; Schutz, 1970). These social conventions devalue what is associated with the feminine. The strength and power of these gendered expectations should not be underestimated. Faludi (1991) has written in detail on the extent to which efforts to roll back these one-sided, traditional expectations have produced a powerful backlash against modern, feminine perspectives on equality between the sexes. As Shakeshift (1989) stated, “[t]he historical records show that women have always been second choice in the selection of school leaders” (p. 81). Since 1990, studies have documented the existence and influence of the traditional barriers that work against women.

### ***Networks and Political Structures***

Gabler (1987) contended that women have not accorded the “ol’ boys” network its due importance in attaining top administrative positions. Women believing that people who work hard and demonstrate skill will be rewarded, are now realizing that a supportive network is as significant as skill and hard work. Consequently, attempts have been made to establish an “old girls” network. But as Kanter (1977) noted, relative representation is a key structural component and these female linkages remain too weak to assist many women, i.e., there are still not enough women, particularly in positions of power, for female networks to be very effective.

Leonard and Papalewis (1987) pointed to the importance of sponsorship for women’s access to administrative positions. They suggested that establishing relationships with sponsors is more difficult for women because mentoring dyads are generally within gender and race. Therefore, females tend to be excluded from these supports, which appear to be crucial to advancement. Whitaker and Lane (1990) indicated that whenever cross mentoring does occur between male mentors and female protégés, sex roles diminish its effectiveness. They emphasized the importance of efforts of women in administration to mentor females who wish to advance into the ranks. Hill and Ragland (1995) indicated that women shared a sense of isolation i.e., a feeling like they are “the only one.”

The traditional bureaucratic model of schools has operated within a political context, led by administrators who governed teachers, students, and staff through formalized goals and procedures (Lee, Smith, & Croninger, 1996). In top-down hierarchical organizations, authoritarian leadership is the preferred pattern for school administration. Men are perceived by the public

as better able than women to handle discipline, particularly at the secondary level. Men also were viewed as more suited than women for working with predominantly male boards of education and dealing with political influences on the superintendency.

Hill and Ragland (1995) noted that men often act as gatekeepers, and make deals before positions are announced: women normally are not privy to those informal agreements. When women enter the policy arena of the superintendency, they must learn to fight biases and negotiate the increasingly political nature of the job. The micro-management of boards, fiscal constraints, and board-superintendent hostilities can lead to disenchantment for those not already entrenched in established power networks.

Whitaker and Lane (1990) noted the perception that finances and tough personnel issues are the strength of males, not females. This belief is reinforced by the structural differences in career paths: success in coaching, secondary principal, and line positions such as finance and personnel for males; the elementary principalship and central office staff positions where curriculum and instruction predominate for females (cf. Hansot & Tyack, 1981; Wiggins & Coggins, 1986). These trajectories provide differential opportunities to learn political skills for navigating various interest groups, both internal and external to the district.

### **The Feminist Leadership Model**

The foregoing discussion of barriers to women superintendents highlights a reality in the field of educational administration. Until recently, much of what has been studied and taught has been based largely on the experiences of white males (Blackmore, 1989; Shakeshaft, 1989) and interpreted from structural-functionalist perspectives (Burrell & Morgan, 1979). Yet, leadership has always been a central focus for research in this field (Fennell, 1999). Shakeshaft (1989) makes the case that studying leadership through women's eyes and experiences is an initial step toward a transformation of leadership theory.

The feminist paradigm critiques dominant white male, control-oriented leadership (Fennell, 1999). When women talk, supervise, or behave in ways not consistent with the dominant paradigm, their work is not credited as leadership (Marshall, 1986). Similarly, the feminized fields of teaching (Lortie, 1975) and child rearing institutions (women who head households and run daycare) are accorded the status of "unimportant" work. Blackmore (1989) stated, "when women's subjective experience does not fit the 'reality' of scientific management, it is treated as an aberration, non-relevant and

deviant” (p. 113). The feminist model challenges hierarchical views of organizational structure and function and questions epistemological assumptions about the nature of humanity inherent in male-dominant theories.

### ***Women, Instruction, and Leadership***

The research on women’s leadership suggests that the traditional top-down hierarchy has been replaced by a web-like organization in which females operate from the center. This allows them to utilize their strengths: acting on their priorities, relating to people, encouraging employees, providing opportunities for collaboration, soliciting input, and opening two-way communication channels. Particularly in educational systems, women’s experiences in teaching and knowledge of curriculum allow them to guide from a position of expertise. Their “natural” empathy and compassion (read “product of gendered socialization mores and folkways”) are essential in creating a positive, collegial workplace environment (Fennell, 1999; Helgesen, 1990; Wesson & Grady, 1994).

### ***Uncertainty in the Educational Terrain***

This general model of female leadership is well adapted to the demands of school districts in the current era of accountability. Ultimately, education involves student learning as its *raison d’être*. No matter how much accountability dictates measurable assessment outcomes, the learning that underlies these test scores remains an uncertain endeavor: (a) highly complex, (b) variable from student to student and school to school, (c) strongly influenced by family background, and (d) dependent upon a number of factors that are beyond the control of the classroom teacher, let alone the superintendent, several layers removed from student contact (cf. Meyer & Rowan, 1978).

The uncertainty in school districts goes beyond the fuzziness of learning outcomes. The environment for schooling is unstable. Threats ranging from cuts in resources to competition from private and religious schools (not to mention home schooling) are exacerbated by efforts among conservative critics to move to a market-driven system of vouchers featuring parental choice (cf. Berliner & Biddle, 1995; Bracey, 2002; Chubb & Moe, 1990). More immediately, the emphasis in many accountability systems is not just high student outcomes, but *increasingly higher* achievement, a value-added perspective (Miller, 1992).

### ***Women and Change***

With uncertainty comes change. When the goals for education are in flux, or are set as targets that are *higher* than current levels, the way things have always been done is not good enough. Best practice needs to be improved. What this implies is a learning organization (Senge, 1990). When results depend upon not only the most up-to-date knowledge available but also on new and more effective ideas, the involvement of everyone in the district is essential. This is particularly the case when learning depends upon highly educated professionals, whose practice is steeped in judgment and fast-paced decision making rather than routine. This is not to suggest that set procedures and practice are not elements of an effective education. One aspect of student mastery is repetition. But ultimately, learning depends upon the stimulation and exchange of ideas. For that, professional judgment is crucial. Even the choice as to how much repetition, when, and in what form requires effective professional input. Not all practice is equally effective (to wit, the over reliance on low level “drill and kill” worksheets in many schools).

Thus uncertainty implies empowerment as an approach to leadership. Optimal organizational output requires the best efforts and ownership of the professionals who inhabit the core technical productive units (classrooms and school). Even more so, these professionals must be engaged in the collaborative search for more effective strategies for engaging students in learning. Neither maximal effort nor better professional practice can be mandated from above. Effective leadership requires that the various stakeholder groups, especially but not limited to professional staff, be involved in the collective response to the challenges of schooling that are both excellent and equitable (cf. Chance, 1986; Roeder, 1999, 2000).

In the uncertain milieu of today's education, women seem to have an instinctive sense of empowerment, based on societal expectations (Irwin, 1995; Rosener, 1990). According to Blackmore (1989) the feminist reconstruction of leadership involves meaningful discourse on organizational life. Workers are viewed as autonomous individuals rather than objects to be manipulated through patriarchal expertise. There is more focus on relationships between individuals and the larger community; power is perceived as multi-dimensional and multi-directional. The key is to empower others rather than to have power over others, with leadership diffused throughout the organization and not tied exclusively to formal roles.

Empowerment is not an end in itself, however. Power undirected is likely to feed the agendas of the groups so empowered, particularly if the stakeholders have long been denied meaningful input and control over their role in the work place. This is illustrated by early returns on site-based decision making (SBDM). School SBDM councils frequently focused their

attention on teacher concerns, governance issues, or community affairs (Talley, 2002). These highly politicized issues essentially had no direct impact inside the iron triangle of learning—the teacher and the student engaged with the curriculum (Lockwood, 1994). Yet those councils that specifically focused their attention on school improvement seemed to produce higher achievement.

There is more widespread evidence that empowerment needs to be directed toward organizational goals. The research on school climate is consistent in this regard. Too much focus on non-learning issues can have negative effects on achievement outcomes. Conran and Beauchamp (1976) found that higher levels of organizational climate (based on the widely used Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, OCDQ, of Halpin & Croft, 1963) actually resulted in lower achievement, a finding confirmed by other analyses of the OCDQ (Lezotte, Miller, Hathaway, Passalacqua, & Brookover, 1980). This phenomenon can be explained by a fundamental distinction: the OCDQ emphasizes esprit de corps and affective teacher concerns; in contrast, school climate instruments in which higher levels of climate are associated with higher achievement have in common an emphasis on factors that influence student outcomes such as teacher expectations, instructional push, time-on-task, and instructional leadership. All such factors are part of the *learning* climate. When adult concerns peripheral to the organization displace attention from the primary goal of student learning, such surprising and unintended effects can occur (Warner & Havens, 1968).

Thus effective leadership demands a vision for the district, educationally focused, with both excellence and equity goals (see Petersen, 1999). The collective efforts of the organization must be guided by this priority. The discipline to ensure that various agendas from different role groups do not subvert this emphasis is a primary responsibility of the empowering leader. Again women seem to have a strong sense of this priority. Socialized as primary caretakers (Gupton & Slick, 1996; Lougheed, 1998; Shakeshaft, 1989), women have a strong “children first” orientation. This child centered value is supplemented by their strong backgrounds in teaching and instructional development (McGarth, 1992; Ortiz & Marshall, 1988). The combination of these two values leads naturally to a vision of instructional success for all children. Schools, programs, professional development—all are judged by adherence to this vision that all children can and will learn and at high levels.

If women’s leadership reflects a strong vision of academic success for all children (consistent with child-centered values and instructional background and expertise) and a commitment to empowering professionals to create a learning organization, there is the question of how they manage the



conflicting demands of the uncertain environment that currently defines education. Balancing multiple political agendas (every group has its own), allocating scarce resources, and monitoring the progress of multiple units requires both an efficient and effective organizational structure and the skills in human relations to bring people together, resolve conflicts, and inspire the best in employees from disparate backgrounds.

The research on feminist leadership indicates that women eschew the traditional hierarchical structure in favor of a more flexible web-like organization. This is in contrast to the male style of top-down management that had served educators so well during the American century: an emphasis on stability, control, and providing an education that was “fitting” for the presumed aptitude of students, i.e., differentiation of curriculum and instruction through ability grouping and tracking (cf. Callahan, 1962; Oakes, 1985; Spring, 1976). However, the prominence of social Darwinism (Hofstadter, 1955) in this industrial model of schooling, with its deleterious effects on minorities, the poor, and special needs children, is now recognized (Miller, 1985; Portes, 2005).

In several respects, women’s web-like model of leadership can be seen as countering the weaknesses of hierarchical management. Being at the center of an organization increases the probability of two-way communication and of direct linkages to multiple stakeholders. Various groups can be more quickly involved in strategic planning and the flattened organizational structure facilitates collaborative efforts among professionals who are asked to work *with* a leader instead of *for* a boss. The flexibility of the webbed structure also works well in an era of environmental flux and uncertain resources. Coupled with the drive for ever higher academic achievement for *all* students, the need for highly motivated, empowered professionals who are themselves learners, open to new and more powerful approaches to instruction, becomes obvious (cf. Helgesen, 1990; Ortiz & Marshall, 1988; Shantz, 1993).

Yet this more open style of leadership does not come without risk. Collaboration, more challenging goals, altered roles, and fundamental changes in beliefs about the capacity of all students to learn (social Darwinism dies hard)—all have a tendency to produce conflict among newly or differently empowered educators (perhaps especially so since teachers have traditionally been among the least empowered of all professionals). Here the interpersonal dimension of the feminist model is crucial. As Rogers (1988) noted, socialization of females encourages affiliation, cooperation, empathy, caring, non-violence, listening to others, and interconnectedness. These skills are essential in negotiating conflicts, valuing the contributions of group members, distributing responsibilities, and building a common vision,

with a mission centered on child welfare. Thus the feminist leadership style combines the flexibility of communication from the center of a webbed organizational structure with the set of human interaction skills that are required to operate this model effectively. If those “people skills” seem to come “naturally” to women, it should be remembered that the experiences of young girls in American society closely match these processes, especially when compared to the “macho” expectations that young boys encounter.

### **Prospects for the Future**

The context for this review is worth noting. In the last decades of the 20th century and continuing today, the male dominant world is increasingly being questioned. Traditional models of leadership that reflected male values and top-down, hierarchical control have been challenged in business (e.g., Barney & Ouchi, 1986; McGregor & Cutcher-Gershenfeld, 2006; Ouchi, 1981; Peters & Waterman, 1982) as well as education (Callahan, 1962; Greenfield, 1974). Similarly, the “rightness” of the traditional family is no longer universally accepted (e.g., Coontz, 1992; D’Antonio & Aldous, 1983). More generally, there is a growing literature on differences between male and female styles (cf. Key, 1996; Sandelands, 2001; Shields, 2002) with the inevitable disagreements on whether these differences are socialized or inherent (see Lippa, 2005).

These debates about sex roles structures and models of leadership can be related to more fundamental changes in the economic system. As society hurtles through the transition from the industrial era to the post-industrial, information age with globally-based service economy (Toffler, 1980), the decline of manufacturing (cf. Bluestone & Harrison, 1982; Wilson, 1987; Wright, 1979) forced institutions across the spectrum to change and adapt to new conditions (cf. Harris, 1979, 1999). The origins of the feminist movement and other societal trends can be traced to this flux in basic economic production (Harris, 1981).

As the economy adapts to post-industrial conditions, theories of leadership must change accordingly. The emphasis on accountability (Linn, 2000; Linn, Baker, & Betebenner, 2002), the search for more efficient models of managing knowledge development (Bukh & Chistensen, 2005; Peters, 1988), and data-based decision making (Halverson, Grigg, Pritchett, & Thomas, 2005) can be seen as factors driving the evolution of district instructional leadership. With value-added increases in achievement becoming the norm (Miller, 1992; Sergiovanni, 1990), superintendents can no longer defer instructional leadership to the school level (Anthes, 2002; Bjork, 1993).

The era of accountability requires schools to be both excellent and equitable (cf. Chance, 1986; Roeder, 1999, 2000). At the same time, many of the state reforms require decentralized decision making such as site-based management (Mohrman, 1993; Talley, 2002; Wohlsetter, Smyer, & Mohrman, 1994), teacher empowerment (Maeroff, 1988; Terry, 1995-1996), or community involvement (Comer, 2005; Crowson, 1992; Haynes & Comer, 1996). Thus superintendents must be committed to the values of caring and diversity to ensure success for *all* students (cf. Brunner, 1998; Noddings, 1991). Yet a powerful vision is not enough. Somehow, the different stakeholder groups across the community, district, and individual schools must be involved in a collegial effort to realize these challenging goals. Top down mandates simply do not work in the complex environment of the knowledge-based, post-industrial world. Successful leadership requires exceptional skills with respect to communication, collaborative empowerment, and caring—for employees as well as the “customers” (students, parents, and community).

Enter the woman superintendent. The set of skills that are emerging from the research on district instructional leadership are essentially parallel to those depicted in studies of women’s educational leadership (Miller, Washington, & Fiene, 2006). The challenges facing schools today are more daunting than ever. *Increasing* student achievement is far more difficult than *maintaining* the level of readiness that children bring from the home. Even more challenging than these overall improvements (excellence dimension) is *closing* achievement gaps (equity dimension) which are strongly associated with racial, class, and cultural differences in the wider stratification hierarchy (cf. Miller & Moore, 2006; Tilly, 1998). Success in this uncertain environment will require more powerful educational models. That clearly implies change. Flexible leadership from the center of a web-like structure, and the concomitant people skills to raise people up and bring them together would seem to be essential for effecting this change. These traits are the very hallmarks of the feminine style, not coincidentally the product of women’s gendered enculturation experiences in a society in which patriarchy still looms large.

## References

- Anthes, K. (2002). *School and district leadership* (No Child Left Behind Policy Brief). Denver: Education Commission of the States. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 468 186)
- Asbury, D. T. (1993). Gender discrimination in the hiring of Alabama secondary public school principals. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 55(02), 534A. (UMI No. 4563271)
- Banks, C. M. (1995). Gender and race as factors in educational leadership and administration. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (pp. 65-80). New York: Macmillan.

- Barney, J. B., & Ouchi, W. G. (Eds.). (1986). *Organizational economics*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Berliner, D. C., & Biddle, B. J. (1995). *The manufactured crisis: Myths, fraud, and the attack on America's public schools*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books.
- Bjork, L. G. (1993). Effective schools-effective superintendents: The emerging instructional leadership role. *Journal of School Leadership*, 3, 246-259.
- Blackmore, J. (1989). Changing from within: Feminist educators and administrative leadership. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 66(3), 19-40.
- Blount, J. M. (1998). *Destined to rule the schools: Women and the superintendency, 1873-1995*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Bluestone, B., & Harrison, B. (1982). *The deindustrialization of America: Plant closings, community abandonment, and the dismantling of basic industry*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowles, B. D. (1990). The silent crisis in educational leadership. *The Education Digest*, 55(4), 12-14.
- Bracey, G. W. (2002). *The war against America's schools*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon/Longman.
- Brunner, C. C. (1998). Can power support an "ethic of care": An examination of the professional practices of women superintendents. *Journal for a Just and Caring Education*, 4, 142-175.
- Bukh, P. N. D., & Christensen, K. S. (Eds.). (2005). *Knowledge management and intellectual capital: Establishing a field of practice*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological paradigms and organizational analysis*. London: Gower.
- Callahan, R. (1962). *Education and the cult of efficiency*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Chance, W. (1986). ". . . the best of educations": *Reforming America's public schools in the 1980's*. United States of America: The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation.
- Chase, S. E., & Bell, C. S. (1994). How search consultants talk about female superintendents. *The School Administrator*, 51(2), 36-38, 40, 42.
- Chubb, J. E., & Moe, T. M. (1990). *Politics, markets, and America's schools*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Comer, J. P. (2005). The rewards of parent participation. *Educational Leadership*, 62(6), 38-42.
- Conran, P. C., & Beauchamp, G. A. (1976, April). *Relationships among leadership, climate, teacher, and student variables in curriculum engineering*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 119 330)
- Coontz, S. (1992). *The way we never were: American families and the nostalgia trap*. New York: BasicBooks.
- Crowson, R. L. (1992). *School-community relations, under reform*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Curcio, J., Morsink, C., & Bridges, S. (1989). Women as leaders: Moving beyond the stage of powerlessness. *Educational Horizons*, 67, 150-155.
- D'Antonio, W. V., & Aldous, J. (Eds.). (1983). *Families and religions: Conflict and change in modern society*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Dopp, B. K., & Sloan, C. A. (1986). Career development and succession of women to the superintendency. *The Clearing House*, 60, 120-126.
- Estler, S. E. (1975). Women as leaders in public education. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 1, 363-387.
- Faludi, S. (1991). *Backlash: The undeclared war against American women*. New York: Crown.
- Fennell, H. (1999). Feminine faces of leadership: Beyond structural-functionalism? *Journal of School Leadership*, 9, 254-358.
- French, J. R. P., Jr., & Raven, B. (1968). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright & A. Zander (Eds.), *Group dynamics* (pp. 259-269). New York: Harper Row.
- Gabler, J. E. (1987). Leadership: A woman's view. In J. T. Sheive & M. B. Schoenheit (Eds.), *ASCD Yearbook. Leadership: Examining the elusive* (pp. 64-77). Arlington, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Greenfield, T. (1974, July). *Theory in the study of organizations and administrative structures: A new perspective*. Paper presented at the Third International Intervisitation Programme of Educational Administration, Bristol, England.
- Grogan, M. (1996). *Voices of women aspiring to the superintendency*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Gupton, S. L., & Slick, G. A. (1996). *Highly successful women administrators: The inside stories of how they got there*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

- Hackney, C. (1994). The interaction of epistemological position, performance self-esteem, and the organizational culture: A study of women at entry and staff levels of educational administration. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 55(09), 2659A.
- Halpin, A. W., & Croft, D. B. (1963). *The organizational climate of schools*. Chicago: Midwest Administration Centre, The University of Chicago.
- Halverson, R., Grigg, J., Prichett, R., & Thomas, C. (2005, September). *The new instructional leadership: Creating data-driven instructional system in schools* (WCER Working Paper No. 2005-9). Madison: Wisconsin Center for Education Research, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Hansot, E., & Tyack, D. (1981). *The dream deferred: A golden age for women school administrators* (Policy Paper No. 81-C2). Stanford, CA: Stanford University, Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 207 161)
- Harris, M. (1979). *Cultural materialism: The struggle for a science of culture*. New York: Random House.
- Harris, M. (1981). *America now: The anthropology of a changing culture*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Harris, M. (1999). *Theories of culture in postmodern times*. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira.
- Haslett, B., Geis, F. L., & Carter, M. R. (1992). *The organizational women: Power and paradox*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Haynes, N. M., & Comer, J. P. (1996). Integrating schools, families, and communities through successful school reform: The School Development Program. *School Psychology Review*, 25, 501-506
- Helgesen, S. (1990). *The female advantage: Women's ways of leadership*. New York: Doubleday.
- Hill, M. S., & Ragland, J. C. (1995). *Women as educational leaders: Opening windows, pushing ceilings*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Hofstadter, R. (1955). *Social Darwinism in American thought* (rev. ed.). Boston: Beacon.
- Hudson, M. J. (1994). Women and minorities in school administration: Re-examining the role of informal job contract systems. *Urban Education*, 28, 386-397.
- Irwin, R. (1995). *A circle of empowerment: Women, education and leadership*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Key, M. R. (1996). *Male/female language: With a comprehensive bibliography* (2nd ed.). Lanham, MD: Scarecrow.
- Koonce, R. (1997). Language, sex, and power: Women and men in the workplace. *Training and Development*, 51(9), 34-39.
- Lad, K. (1998). Why are there so few high school principals? In B. J. Irby & G. Brown (Eds.), *Women as school executives: Voices and visions* (pp. 73-81). Commerce, TX: Texas Council of Women School Executives.
- Lee, V. E., Smith, J. B., & Croninger, R. G. (1996). Restructuring high schools helps improve student achievement. *Wisconsin Center for Education Research (WCER) Highlights*, 8(1), 4-5, 9.
- Leonard, P. Y., & Papalewis, R. (1987). The underrepresentation of women and minorities in educational administration: Patterns, issues, and recommendations. *Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership*, 7, 188-207.
- Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science; selected theoretical papers* (D. Cartwright, Ed.). New York: Harper.
- Lezotte, L. W., Miller, S. K., Hathaway, D. V., Passalacqua, J., & Brookover, W. B. (1980). *School learning climate and student achievement: A social systems approach to increased student learning*. Tallahassee, FL: National Teacher Crops, Florida State University Foundation.
- Linn, R. L. (2000). Assessments and accountability. *Educational Researcher*, 29(2), 4-16.
- Linn, R. L., Baker, E. L., & Betebenner, D. W. (2002). Accountability systems: Implications of requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. *Educational Researcher*, 31(6), 3-16.
- Lippa, R. A. (2005). *Gender, nature, and nurture* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Little, P. S. (1998). *The effect of rural values on personnel selection practices in Kentucky public school districts*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Louisville.
- Lockwood, A. T. (1994, Fall). The iron triangle [Interview with Stephen K. Miller, school effectiveness research]. *Focus in Change*, 16, 15-17
- Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lougheed, J. I. (1998). *Fifteen Year Study, 1984-1998: Assessing attitudes of women and men toward women leaders and a comparison of leadership styles of women and men* (Monograph). Women in Leadership Forum, Oakland University, Rochester, MI.

- Maeroff, G. I. (1988). *The empowerment of teachers: Overcoming the crisis of confidence*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Maienza, J. G. (1986). The superintendency: Characteristics of access for men and women. *Educational Administrative Quarterly*, 22(4), 59-79.
- Mark, S. F. (1986). *Gender differences among mid-level administrators*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, San Antonio. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 268 877)
- Marshall, S. (1986). Women reach for the top spot. *The School Administrator*, 43(10), 10-13.
- McCreight, C. (1999). *Female superintendents, barriers, and the struggle for equity*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 432 041)
- McGarth, S. T. (1992). Here come the women! *Educational Leadership*, 49(5), 62-65.
- McGregor, D., & Cutcher-Gershenfeld, J. (2006). *The human side of enterprise* (Annotated ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Merle, A. M. (1999). *Women's journeys to educational administration positions*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, SK.
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1978). The structure of educational organizations. In M. W. Meyer & Associates (Eds.), *Environments and organizations* (pp. 78-107). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, S. K. (1985). Research on exemplary schools: An historical perspective. In G. R. Austin & H. Garber (Eds.), *Research on exemplary schools* (pp. 3-30). Orlando, FL: Academic.
- Miller, S. K. (1992). Changing conceptions of "good schools:" Implications for reforming urban education. *Education and Urban Society*, 25, 71-84.
- Miller, S. K., & Moore, B. D. (2006). *Whither race? Demographic and grade level influences on reading assessment in a desegregated metropolitan district*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Miller, S. K., Washington, Y. O. C., & Fiene, J. R. (2006). *Female leadership and district instructional improvement: Converging fields in the era of accountability*. Manuscript in preparation.
- Mohrman, S. A. (1993). *School based management and school reform: Comparisons to private sector organizational renewal*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Public Policy and Management, Washington, DC.
- Napier, L., & Willower, D. (1990-1991). Female high school principals' perceptions of their jobs and their interactions with males. *High School Journal*, 74, 118-122.
- Noddings, N. (1991). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Ortiz, F., & Marshall, C. (1988). Women in educational administration. In N. J. Boyan (Ed.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp. 123-141). New York: Longman.
- Ouchi, W. G. (1981). *Theory Z: How American business can meet the Japanese challenge*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Paddock, S. (1977). *Careers in educational administration: Are women the exception*. Eugene: University of Oregon Center for Educational Policy and Management.
- Patterson, J. A. (1994, March). *Shattering the glass ceiling: Women in school administration*. Paper presented at the Women's Studies Graduate Symposium, Chapel Hill, NC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 383 098)
- Pavan, B. N., & Robinson, R. J. (1991, April). *Reflections of female school administrators regarding their careers*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 334 676)
- Peters, T. J. (1988). *Thriving on chaos: Handbook for a management revolution*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H., Jr. (1982). *In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best-run companies*. New York: Warner Books.
- Petersen, G. J. (1999). Demonstrated actions of instructional leaders: An examination of five California superintendents. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 7(18). Retrieved December 2, 2005, from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v7n18.html>
- Polanyi, M. (1967). *The tacit dimension*. New York: Doubleday Anchor.
- Portes, P. R. (2005). *Dismantling educational inequality: A cultural-historical approach to closing the achievement gap*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Powell, G. N. (1988). *Women and men in management*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Restine, N. (1993). *Women in administration: Facilities for change*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin.
- Roeder, P. W. (1999). *Education reform and equitable excellence: The Kentucky experiment* [Electronic version]. Lexington, KY: RDS.
- Roeder, P. W. (2000). *Education reform and equitable excellence: The Kentucky experiment (Update-June 2000), Race, poverty, and urban schools in Kentucky*. Retrieved March 10, 2002, from <http://www.uky.edu/~proeder/keraweb.htm>
- Rogers, J. L. (1988). New paradigm leadership: Integrating the female ethos. *Initiatives*, 51(4), 1-8.
- Rosener, J. B. (1990). Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review*, 68(6), 119-125.
- Ryan, W. (1976). *Blaming the victim* (rev., updated ed.). New York: Vintage.
- Ryder, M. (1994). Women breaking the statistical norm in educational administration. *Thrust for Educational Leadership*, 23(7), 28-33.
- Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1985). The treatment of sex equity in teacher education. In S. Klein (Ed.), *Handbook for achieving sex equity in teacher education* (pp. 145-161). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Sandelands, L. E. (2001). *Male and female in social life*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Schmuck, P. A. (1975). *Sex differentiation in public school administration*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Schmuck, P. (1980). Changing women's representation in school management: A systems perspective. In S. K. Biklen & M. Brannigan (Eds.), *Women and educational leadership* (pp. 239-259). Lexington, MA: Lexington.
- Schutz, A. (1970). *Alfred Schutz on phenomenology and social relationships: Selected writings* (H.R. Wagner, Ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Doubleday.
- Sennett, R., & Cobb, J. (1972). *The hidden injuries of class*. New York: Knopf.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1990). *Value-added leadership: How to get extra-ordinary performance in schools*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Shakeshaft, C. (1989). *Women in educational administration* (rev. ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Shantz, D. (1993). Collaborative leadership and female administrators: A perfect partnership for the future. *The Canadian School Executive*, 11(2), 17-21.
- Shields, S. A. (2002). *Speaking from the heart: Gender and the social meaning of emotion*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Skrla, L. (1998). *The social construction of gender in the superintendency*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 425 501)
- Spring, J. H. (1976). *The sorting machine: National educational policy since 1945*. New York: McKay.
- Tallerico, M., & Burstyn, J. (1996). Retaining women in the superintendency: The location matters. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 32(Suppl.), 642-665. Retrieved October 30, 2000, from [wpnet.com/cgi-bin/epwtop/page](http://wpnet.com/cgi-bin/epwtop/page)
- Talley, W. K. (2002). Building instructional capacity through school councils. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Louisville, 2002). *Digital Dissertations*. (AAT 3054188)
- Terry, P. M. (1995-1996). Empowerment. *National Forum of Education Administration and Supervision Journal*, 12(3), 13-24.
- Tilly, C. (1998). *Durable inequality*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Toffler, A. (1980). *The third wave*. New York: Morrow.
- Warner, W. K., & Havens, A. E. (1968). Goal displacement and the intangibility of organizational goals. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 12, 539-555.
- Wesson, L. H., & Grady, M. L. (1994). An analysis of women urban superintendents: A national study. *Urban Education*, 24, 412-424.
- Whitaker, K., & Lane, K. (1990). Is a woman's place in school administration? *The School Administrator*, 47(2), 8-12.
- Wiggins, T., & Coggins, C. (1986). Gender bias in superintendent selection: A projective analysis. *Journal of Educational Research*, 80, 115-120.
- Wilson, W. J. (1987). *The truly disadvantaged: The inner city, the underclass, and public policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wohlsetter, P., Smyer, R., & Mohrman, S.A. (1994). New Boundaries for school-based management: The high involvement model. *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 16, 268-286.

- Worell, J., & Remer, P. (1992). *Feminist perspectives in therapy: An empowerment model for women*. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Wright, J. P. (1979). *On a clear day you can see General Motors: John Z. DeLorean's look inside the automotive giant*. New York: Avon.