

01254

Women and Educational Leadership

73.05
K72
3748

COORDINACION DE HUMANIDADES



PROGRAMA UNIVERSITARIO DE ESTUDIOS DE GENERO
"Centro de Información y Documentación"

Edited by

Sari Knopp Biklen

The Education Designs Group

Marilyn B. Brannigan

Syracuse University

- 1. Educación
- 2. Mujeres
- 3. Liderazgo en la educación
- 4. Género y educación

LexingtonBooks

D.C. Heath and Company
Lexington, Massachusetts
Toronto

ed. de 1980

Introduction: Barriers to Equity—Women, Educational Leadership, and Social Change

Sari Knopp Biklen

As men and women involved in struggles for social change can testify, change is difficult.¹ People, especially those in comfortable circumstances and sometimes even those at the bottom of one heap or another, adapt slowly and with resistance to movements to redress social grievances. Perhaps to think otherwise is naive. As Frederick Douglass noted, one must expect change to upset the calm order of nature. Change is by its very nature tumultuous.

As years pass, however, generations examine issues with different perspectives, and what was difficult for one group lacks controversy for the next. Education for women is an example. Originally, extending educational rights to women (even to the extent of providing public means for literacy) threatened male dominance in society. Benjamin Rush's arguments for female education were convincing not only because they were functional but because they did not challenge the sanctity of the family or the superiority of males. The argument for women's education focused on its usefulness for women's domestic role (Cott, 1977).

When women struggled for access to higher education, resistance had to be fought again. Edward Clarke's *Sex in Education*, published in 1874, predicted that women who went to college would become insane or sterile because protracted study would take energy from the ovaries and give it to the brain. (Gynecological theory of the times postulated that one organ was dominant for each of the sexes: the ovary for the female and the brain for the male. Hence it was natural that men go to college.) Other groups used humor rather than science as a means of opposition. The *Springfield (Massachusetts) Republican*, for example, noted in 1835 the founding of a new "female college" in Kentucky:

The Kentucky Legislative (*sic*) has conferred upon Messrs Van Doren's Institution for Young Ladies in Lexington, the charter rights and standing of a College by the name of Van Doren's College for Young Ladies. A diploma and honorary degrees of M.P.L. (Mistress of Polite Literature), M.M. (Mistress of Music), and M.I. (Mistress of Instruction) may be given.

The editor then suggested other possible degrees:

M.P.M (Mistress of Pudding Making), M.D.N. (Mistress of the Darning Needle), M.S.B. (Mistress of the Scrubbing Brush), M.C.S. (Mistress of Common Sense). The Professors should be chosen from farmer's wives and the Laboratory should be a kitchen. Honorary degrees might include H.W. (Happy Wife), H.H. (Happy Husband) and M.W. R.F. (Mother of a Well Regulated Family) (Edwards and Richey, 1947: 412).

The situation did not seem as threatening to the editors of the *Springfield Republican* as it later appeared to Dr. Clarke.

In the field of education today, although the arenas have changed, inequality has not disappeared; for those women interested in leadership roles in the educational system, there are still battles to be fought. The content of the controversy has changed, but women must still prove themselves capable of taking social roles that defy traditional organization and values. What issues engage women who wish to become educational leaders? What issues have educators and social scientists raised in their discussions of women's position in the educational hierarchy? In answering these questions it is as important for us to examine the motives and values of educational researchers as it is to examine the content of their research.

This introduction will examine three major issues that have defined both the nature of the conflict in which women have been engaged and the values that traditionally have shaped the study of the problem. These three issues include the semiprofessional status of the teaching profession and its relationship to the pool from which leaders come; the discrimination women face both in their aspirations to leadership positions and in their representation in the field; and constraints women face in their work lives, including family constraints, issues of marginality, and internal psychological issues. Finally, women's concerns for educational leadership will be located in the larger context of social change in women's lives and in the field of education. Would increasing the number of women in educational leadership positions mean that our educational system will be improved?

The Semiprofessional Status of Teaching

One of the more interesting and deviant aspects of the careers of educational leaders (compared with other occupations) has been the dominance of women in the pool from which leaders traditionally emerge and the absence of women at the top of the hierarchy. Whereas women have been excluded also from leadership positions in other fields, one can point in those fields to the problems women face even at entry level. But women make up the ground force in education—over two-thirds of American teachers are women—however, that is where they tend to stay: only 14 percent of school principals are female

(National Education Association, 1973), and only 0.6 percent of the superior tendencies are held by women (Clement, 1975). What do we know about the pool and about the forces that shape its character? What has the historical development of the status of the teaching profession and the development of the teaching-supervising relationship taught us?

Etzioni (1969) has suggested that the semiprofessions (that is, teaching, nursing, social work) are characterized by shorter training, less legitimate status, less right to privileged communication, and less autonomy from supervision or societal control than are the professions. Additionally, semiprofessional workers are characterized as aspiring to full-fledged status partly because their only alternative status is that of the nonprofessional blue-collar or white-collar worker, a level below the aspirations of teachers (Etzioni, 1969).²

Historical attitudes toward teaching are instructive as well. Teachers' early training was minimal. For most of the nineteenth century, educational level of prospective teachers reached 2 years of normal-school training. Since normal training usually occurred at the secondary school level, most teachers probably had the equivalent of a high school education (Tyack, 1974; Woody, 1966, vol. 1). This limited training, however, meshed with superintendents' image of the preferred teacher, one who would be subordinate and would "toe the line" as did their students (Tyack, 1974).

The entry of women into the teaching profession fitted both the ideology and the pocket-books of school officials. Comments in journals and other public records linked the need for the subordination of teachers with the popular notions about females. In 1878, for example, *Harpers* reported that "women teachers are often preferred by superintendents because they are more willing to comply with established regulations and less likely to ride headstrong hobbies." And in 1841, the Boston school committee commended women teachers because "they are less intent on scheming for future honors or emoluments (than men). As a class, they never look forward, as young men almost invariably do, to a period of legal emancipation from parental control" (Tyack, 1974). And the report of a committee meeting in 1844 on the subject of employing women teachers in New York State announced that women "are much more apt to be content with, and continue in, the occupation of teaching" (Woody, 1966, vol. 1). These qualities seemed to fit women well to the tightly structured, authoritarian school system.

Bringing women into the system met approval on two fronts: with taxpayers' desire to spend as little as possible on public education as well as with the desire of superintendents to control their subordinates. Since the expense of common schools was objectionable to many citizens, they welcomed a cheap supply of labor. During the nineteenth century women teachers received salaries one-half to three-fourths less than men. Sometimes they received as little as 50 cents a week and "board around" (Curti, 1935). Tyack (1974) reports that even in 1870 and 1880 women were earning only about one-third

of what men did, \$35 for men and \$12 for women, and these figures only represent city school figures. Whereas men had been regarded as "the natural teachers" in the eighteenth century (Woody, 1966, vol. 1), in the nineteenth century financial arguments won and teaching came to be seen as woman's natural profession. Arguments linking the cheapness of women as a labor supply and women's "natural" ability to teach the young multiplied. Emma Willard argued that not only were women "naturally" suited to teach but, equally important, they could be hired to teach at lower salaries (Cott, 1977). Catharine Beecher also looked to women to staff the common schools:

But where are we to raise such an army of teachers as are required for this great work? Not from the sex which finds it so much more honorable, easy, and lucrative, to enter the many roads to wealth and honor open in this land. But few will turn from these to the humble, un-honored toils of the schoolroom and its penurious reward.

It is WOMAN who is to come at this emergency, and meet the demand—woman, whom experience and testimony have shown to be the best, as well as the cheapest guardian and teacher of childhood, in the school as well as the nursery (Beecher, 1851).

Women were thought to make good teachers because teaching fit into their maternal destiny. They could do the job better than men could because they were more gentle, patient, loving, and nurturing (Woody, 1966, vol. 1). A legislator in New York State even argued that women make better teachers of young children because of their "very weakness," for they "taught pupils whose 'intellectual faculties' were less developed than the affections. Thus women had more 'access to the heart' of little children because of their 'peculiar faculties'" (Tyack, 1974). Although these qualities may indeed nurture young children, they are not ones traditionally perceived as qualities for effective leadership.

Lortie (1975) has suggested that when teaching came to be seen as women's work: "given the relative position of the young and the female in the nineteenth century this probably reduced rather than augmented its social rank." To some women of the day, this came as no surprise. Feminist Susan B. Anthony, for example, attended a teachers' meeting in 1852 and attempted to answer the objection another educator raised that teachers were not so highly respected as ministers, doctors, and lawyers. She observed:

It seems to me you fail to comprehend the cause of the disrespect of which you complain. Do you not see that so long as society says woman has not brains enough to be a doctor, lawyer, or minister, but has plenty to be a teacher, every man of you who condescends to teach tacitly admits before all Israel and the sun that he has no more brains than a woman? (from I. Harper, *The Life and Work of Susan B. Anthony*, in Curti, 1935: 190).

Another perspective existed however. Whereas the public may have encouraged women to enter the teaching field because of their maternal destiny, their "peculiar weakness," and whereas Emma Willard and Catharine Beecher may have capitalized on this concept as well as the market for an inexpensive labor supply, Beecher saw teaching as a way of creating independence for women:

[A] profession is to be created for women . . . a profession as honorable and as lucrative for her as the legal, medical, and theological professions are for men. This is the way in which thousands of intelligent and respectable women, who toil for a pittance scarcely sufficient to sustain life, are to be relieved and elevated (Woody, 1966, vol. 1: 465).

Although teaching may have enabled women to rise above poverty and become more self-sustaining, the field never proved as honorable as the men's professions.

Contemporary sociological analysis has reflected on the low social status of teachers (Caplow, 1954; Charters, 1963; Lieberman, 1956; Lortie, 1975; Waller, 1932). The ambiguous social position teachers occupy has not been ignored:

It is honored and disdained, praised as "dedicated service" and lampooned as "easy work" . . . The services performed by teachers have usually been seen as above the run of everyday work, and the occupation has had the aura of a special mission honored by society. But social ambiguity has stalked those who undertook the mission, for the real regard shown those who taught has never matched the professed regard. Teaching is a status accorded high respectability of a particular kind; but those occupying it do not receive the level or types of deference reserved for those working in the learned professions, occupying high government office, or demonstrating success in business (Lortie, 1975).

Social scientists have described the status of teachers in terms of its constancy over the years and have related low status to various factors, including the low degree of professionalization and the predominance of women in teaching (Lieberman, 1956). Another factor claimed to lessen the status of teachers is their lack of autonomy. The high level of bureaucracy and the tight control within buildings and within school systems lower the public's image as well as the actuality of teachers' independence. Again, social scientists have related this lack of professional autonomy to the preponderance of women in the profession. The public is seen as "less willing to grant autonomy to women than to men" (Simpson and Simpson, 1969: 199), and yet perhaps it is the social science profession as much as the public which is unwilling to grant this

autonomy. One analyst, for example, has noted: "In some ways, the school principal resembles, not so much the administrator in the world of business and industry, as the patriarch presiding over a harem. The duties differ but the structure is similar" (Hall, 1966: 45).

Finally, it is the very preponderance of women in the profession that is seen to diminish its status. The occupation is described as socially desirable for American women, "but for men it occupies a rank well below the topmost levels of work achievement" (Lortie, 1969: 20). It is also described as fitting feminine socialization patterns, meshing with the family needs of working mothers, and, because it is envisioned as an occupation attractive to those who want to work with people and be of service, it is seen to appeal more to women than to men. These images are not so far removed, perhaps, from Catharine Beecher's nineteenth-century image of women's "maternal destiny" suiting her for her natural profession, teaching.

Social scientists have used these images of women to explain why the pool has not produced candidates for leadership in the field. Whereas men who enter teaching describe their "career interests," women are said to view their work as "jobs." Their primary allegiance is said to be to the family, and consequently they are less "intrinsically" committed to work than are men (Simpson and Simpson, 1969: 199). It is said that women do not see teaching as a career, they see it as an adjunct to domestic life: "They want it to be something they can slip into, and step out of, as it suits their interests in their homes and/or families" (Hall, 1966: 43). Women have been characterized as "tractable subordinates," compliant, deferent to men, desiring pleasant social relations, and consequently afraid of conflict, holistically rather than task-oriented: "This lack of drive toward intellectual mastery, added to the holistic focus on clients and the fact that women tend to readily follow directives from above, lessens the likelihood that semi-professional women will develop an ideology of professional autonomy and colleague control" (Simpson and Simpson, 1969: 239).

Do these values indicate women's perspectives on their work as teachers, on their careers, and on their desire for leadership, or do they reflect a lack of familiarity with or bias toward women in research perspectives? The means by which cultural values are structurally maintained have often been ignored. The following example characterizes the "you can lead a horse to water but you can't make her drink" approach: "it seems clear that women's increased participation in the labor force has not led them to view work as men do" (Simpson and Simpson, 1969: 244).

For those women who do choose to view work from a "masculine" perspective these researchers suggest that it is a negative choice: "Probably, in the case of women who attend graduate school, lack of a husband is often the reason for the extra education and the career choice, rather than vice versa" (Simpson and Simpson, 1969: 214). And yet some of their data point

to other, and more positive influences on their choice. Caplow (1954) suggested that occupational inequality for women was guaranteed by customs, folkways, and a family structure that promoted the role of housewife as the leading ideal for women. Contrary to their own analysis of data, however, Simpson and Simpson found material in their own research to support Caplow. They found in a study of nurses, for example, that those who worked solely for money and whose work role was an "instrumental" extension of their family role, felt great impetus toward professionalization (Simpson and Simpson, 1969: 207). They also found that if the husband was a colleague in the same field, chances were increased that a woman in one of the semi-professions would be committed to her work. Teachers' husbands who were also educators, for example, showed more favorable attitudes toward their wives continuing to teach than other husbands (Simpson and Simpson, 1969: 216). One's position in the family, and the degree of supportiveness of family members, then, affected nurses' and teachers' attitudes toward their work. Data belied analysis.

The examination of conflicting male and female perspectives on accruing material and financial benefits in teaching also reflect research bias. In an in-depth study of the school teacher, for example, Lortie oddly compares the financial demands on married men with those on unmarried women, assuming that only unmarried women approach teaching as a career (or take on the instrumental role):

[T]he demands encountered by men and women throughout their working lives differ markedly. Most women who persist in teaching and do not marry do not meet sudden, sharp increases in their financial responsibilities—they can often use additions in income as they please. But most men who stay in classroom teaching marry and have children—their income expenditure profiles typically show a period during which costs rise sharply while income increases gradually. For most men teachers, therefore, similar incomes have less "value" than for women teachers: they represent a less useful contribution to the performance of their principal roles (Lortie, 1975: 10).

Lortie suggests, consequently, that this financial imbalance serves as an impetus for men to climb the educational career ladder, although it does not serve that purpose for unmarried women. Again, one might ask whether this analysis follows the data or the investigator's own attitudes.

Other perspectives are, however, reflected in the research. In *Education as a Profession*, Liebermann suggests that the low status teachers maintain is due, partly, to prejudicial attitudes toward women, and that one change that would aid education in becoming a leading profession would be for there to occur "a cultural revolution concerning the role of women in American society" (Lieberman, 1959). Another investigator has suggested that teachers' feelings

and the social literature on teaching reflect conflicting orientations: "In recent years, a severe cultural lag has developed between the teacher stereotyped by culture and the professional literature and the real lives of contemporary teachers" (Lightfoot, 1977: 404). Teachers desire more autonomy than they are described as seeking:

They want acceptance as working equals, equality of status, and recognition of their competencies in their own area of responsibility . . . Putting it bluntly, they do not want to be talked down to but they do want to be talked to at eye level . . . In the dignity of their professional competence they do not appreciate being directed in every detail of their daily function (Azzarelli, 1966).

These values are finding political expression in the rise of teachers' unions. More research examining teachers' perspectives on their work must also be undertaken.

Lightfoot suggests that one of the difficulties teachers face is related to the connections people make between the image of the teacher and images that belong to the family. In spite of conflicts between teachers and families in almost every school, teaching is often seen as an extension of mothering:

[T]he blurring of distinctions between family life and the profession of teaching has provided social scientists with an opportunity to give less attention to the characteristics and qualities of the professional and work role. Such a continuity has led sociologists to assert the lack of commitment and attachment that women feel toward their work lives (Lightfoot, 1977: 405).

Women, then, face difficulties establishing a professional identity in the context of prevalent social values.

The relationship between teachers and leaders of teachers raises questions about the interplay between others' perceptions of workers and their own feelings and attitudes. People's perceptions about their ability influence achievement more than their actual ability or level of aspiration. As Joan Burstyn discusses in chapter 4, "in any society there are always individuals who would like to be leaders but who, because they belong to some group—whether of religion, race, class, political persuasion, or sex—are not perceived by others as people who could ever lead them." She notes that one can become a leader only when a reciprocal relationship exists between that person and other people, the potential followers, and contributes an historical analysis of perceptions of women as potential leaders.

Discrimination against Women in Educational Leadership

In December of 1972 Myron Lieberman was held up in his attempts to leave Cambridge, Massachusetts, by a heavy rainfall, and he wandered into a Phi Delta Kappa chapter meeting at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. The Harvard chapter was trying to decide what to do about Phi Delta Kappa's exclusion of women from its ranks. The Phi Delta Kappa board of directors had suspended the Harvard and Cornell chapters and gave as their reasons that they "were instructed by the 1971 Biennial Council to suspend any chapter reporting the initiation of women in violation of the Phi Delta Kappa constitution" (Lieberman, 1973). Lieberman's predecessor in the editor's chair at the *Phi Delta Kappan*, the society's prestigious and well-known journal, had resigned over the "woman question." *Phi Delta Kappan's* masthead proclaims that it is "A Journal for the Promotion of Leadership in Education."

Phi Delta Kappa, a leading professional fraternity in the field of educational leadership, excluded women from participation for most of its lengthy history. It is a significant example of the kind of discrimination women have faced in different aspects of the profession. It is the purpose of this section to sketch some of the dimensions of the problem and to examine what is meant by discrimination against women in educational leadership.

Numbers alone offer some guidelines to the dimension of the problem. Whereas women comprise 67 percent of all teachers, they hold only 14 percent of all principalships. Whereas men comprise only 16 percent of elementary school teachers, they hold 80 percent of the elementary school principalships. And whereas half of secondary school teachers are women, men hold 97 percent of the junior high principalships and 99 percent of the senior high school principalships (National Education Association, 1973).

At higher levels the picture worsens. Of over 14,000 superintendents in this country, women number less than one hundred (Clement, 1975). As Jacqueline Clement describes so well in chapter 8, the profile of the school superintendent is a white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant, married man from rural origins. Women at all levels of school administration earn lower salaries than men and are much less represented at state and national levels (Clement, 1975). Decision making at the state and federal level is a male activity. Additionally, as most people are now aware, the proportion of women principals has declined quite dramatically over the last 50 years, from about 55 percent of the principalships in 1928 to 20 percent in 1973 (Fischel and Pottker, 1977; Clement, 1975; Estler, 1975).

What do these figures represent? Although it is difficult to separate discriminatory attitudes and situations from the effects of discrimination on groups and from the ways discriminatory attitudes may be internalized, this

section will be limited to those aspects of discrimination that are directed at women and that might give insight into the kinds of discrimination women have faced.

Could these figures mean that women are underrepresented in leadership positions because they are less competent than men? The data overwhelmingly proclaim not. Pottker and Fischel reviewed both behavioral and attitudinal studies in an examination of the research on the performance of women principals. The behavioral studies they examined measured issues related to instructional supervision, relations with students, parents, community, and general administration. The attitudinal studies they examined measured teacher attitudes toward women principals, the recruitment and hiring of women principals, and attitudes of women principals towards their job (Fischel and Pottker, 1977). In general, they found few significant differences between the behavior of men and women principals, although women principals were perceived as somewhat more capable in areas that involved relating to students, staff, or parents. As Estler (1975) suggests, "the perceived effectiveness of women as leaders is certainly as high as the perceived effectiveness of their male counterparts, if not higher." Given the higher selectivity of the selection process for women in the principalship, however, these data may suggest only that to make the grade women have to be superior to men or that the greater striving and loneliness required in the process of ascending the career ladder insures that only the best women will succeed. Competence, then, is not an issue.

In spite of their competence, however, women do face problems of discrimination. First, social attitudes about women's competency levels have been extensively documented in recent years. Women have been described as too emotional, not task-oriented enough, too dependent on feedback and evaluations from others, lacking independence and autonomy (Cox, 1976; Tavis and Offir, 1977). Another set of discriminatory attitudes that hinder women's representation in educational leadership refer specifically to education. As suggested, women are seen as able to nurture children and follow directions in a tight, bureaucratic, hierarchical structure, but not able to construct or dominate the structure itself. Research on performance counterbalances these stereotypical attitudes.

Another source of attitudinal difficulties that women face are the differential ways in which women are evaluated. For example, as Epstein has discussed, whereas men are judged on the job by their level of effectiveness at work, women are evaluated according to the many roles they are able to play and to integrate well. Women must be judged competent in their female roles as well as their occupational roles (Epstein, 1974). Additionally, as in the case with other stereotypes about exploited and less powerful groups, familiarity breeds contentment. Research indicates that in spite of teachers' beliefs that no difference in the leadership abilities of men and women principals exists, male teachers prefer working for male administrators. Men teachers who have

worked with a woman principal, however, are more favorable to the concept of a woman boss than those men who have not (Fischel and Pottker, 1977). In this case, then, perceptions change when they are related to day-to-day inter-change.

Daily contact does not always affect attitudes and perceptions, however. As Mary Winslow reports in chapter 15, women school administrators are accused of being out of the building too much when in fact men school administrators are actually out of the building more. Winslow suggests that perhaps this evaluation represents the home ethic transplanted to the workplace. An additional problem of evaluation women face is related to the numbers they represent. This problem of tokenism and marginality will, however, be discussed in the next section.

A final attitude about women that has helped create discrimination relates to newer managerial concepts of school principals and the district superintendents. As a position paper prepared by the National Conference on Women in Educational Policy has suggested, changes in school structure and organization during the 1960s and the 1970s help to explain the lack of women in educational leadership positions: "there was and is a deliberate and continuing effort to move the school's administration and management from that of a cottage industry or small factory to that of a modern corporation" (National Conference on Women in Educational Policy Making, 1975: 3). Noting the trend, the group argues that the more streamlined the managerial structure has become, the fewer are women leaders. The historical development of the managerial mystique has created boundaries that exclude women. As schooling becomes more of a business, those in administrative positions turn to their image of effective business managers: business men.

Other issues of discrimination that women face relate less to attitudes and perceptions than to problems of job training, selection processes, and the nature of the position attained. Several difficulties are listed at recruitment and hiring stages. Colleges and universities make no special effort to recruit women for training to become principals; women teachers receive less encouragement from supervisors to become administrators; and strong bias exists against appointing women to administrative positions. In addition, to be appointed to an administrative position, women teachers must possess superior qualifications and skills (Fischel and Pottker, 1977).

In her study of deterrents to women's careers in school management Schmuck (1975) interviewed women and men in administrative positions both in the Oregon public schools and in county agencies. She found not only a strong cultural norm that encouraged men to seek managerial positions and discouraged women from the same attempts but also differential treatment on the basis of sex. Whereas some women described discrimination they faced on the job, other women pointed out that women face discrimination before the final selection process: "I'm not a flag-waving liberber but I do get burned

up when I see blatant examples of discrimination. There are a few women applying and I can honestly say they were not discriminated against in the screening procedures. It takes place before that" (Schmuck, 1975: 347).

A number of filters within the educational system have been identified that, at each level, lower the number of female representatives. One set of filters "revolves around the prejudices of selection by the school system. Women are often simply not considered for leadership positions, regardless of qualifications" (Estler, 1975: 367). Schmuck's (1975) interviews with male administrators reflected some of these difficulties. Three examples indicate the range of the problem:

Screening committees . . . want demonstrated competence and they measure it by winning football teams. They want somebody who can work with the public and who the public knows and so again it's the winning football coach. Everybody ignores the long lists of criteria and chooses on the basis of winning football teams. The deck is stacked against women.

It's easier to work without women. Principals and superintendents are a management team. It fosters interdependence and mutual support. We need each other for survival. It's no evil liaison—it's just pure politics. I wonder if we could hang together so well if some of us were women.

I work very closely with the principals. We work long hours and sometimes very late. Frankly, I would be reluctant to hire a woman principal—especially if she were attractive. I might have some hell to pay at home.

Regardless of qualifications, many women are not even considered for openings.

Some women are hired for administrative positions, however, and continue to face difficulties. As Rosie Doughty indicates in chapter 10, black women face a double bind because they must fight prejudicial attitudes on two fronts. And the positions to which women are appointed are often in the most difficult and troubled districts. Jacqueline Clement also underscores the difficulty such districts pose for success. The positions in stable urban areas of suburban communities more often go to men than to women. These are the parameters of discrimination women face in their aspirations to become educational leaders.

Constraints Women Face in Their Work Lives

Women who are interested in becoming educational leaders, or who have been chosen for a leadership position, find that their working life is partly shaped by the constraints and contingencies of being a woman. Women who have

careers are the subjects of research studies for the same reason that women must face constraints in their work lives: to be a woman and to have a career is not yet socially accepted as natural. Consequently, it emerges as a subject for study. Just as researchers have examined the poor, and why they do not "make it," so do they study women, and why they do make it. Both are seen as deviants from the traditionally accepted social patterns.

Ironically, women who do succeed face similar attitudes as men who do not succeed. Their success (or failure) must be justified and explained. Because one's femininity is tied to being a family member, specifically a mother, women must explain how the two roles, professional and mother, can be juggled. The research on working women, for example, has described the effects of "maternal deprivation" on their children, while for working fathers, the more neutral term of "father absence" (not paternal deprivation) is employed (Rossi, 1964). Researchers have felt that they must locate social explanations for women's success, as they have located social explanations for men's lack of success.

Three types of constraints create pressures on women in their jobs that are not related to the intrinsic nature of the work itself. These constraints are: family constraints, the constraint of marginality, and what might be called internal, psychological, or self-imposed constraints.

Family Constraints

The relationship between family and career has been seen as a difficult one for women because of the conflicting expectations that women who work and who are family members must face. These expectations include traditional values regarding women's place and the sometimes awkward or difficult logistics involved in coordinating family and work life. The nature of one's family certainly plays a role in determining the degree of difficulty. The absence of children, for example, increases the likelihood that women will work professionally, and the age of the children plays a role in determining the question of career continuity (Bailyn, 1975). Occupational inequality has been related to women's position in the family: "It is very unlikely that the proportion of women employed will sustain any marked long-term increase so long as the contemporary family structure remains intact . . ." (Caplow, 1954: 234). Occupational structure may have to change as well to accommodate women. The structure of occupations has been called inflexible (Holmstrom, 1971), and the university in particular seems to have been designed for the "married family-free man" (Hochschild, 1975). The family-career dyad needs changing: "the problem for women in academic or other sorts of careers is to alter the link between family and career and more generally, between private and public

life" (Hochschild, 1975: 73). Let us examine some difficulties caused by this particular link.

One kind of family problem is limitation on mobility. In spite of career patterns that press for it, many women do not feel that they can move to take jobs in a different community and consequently their access to career positions is limited. Additionally, whereas the men in a study of school administrators (Schmuck, 1975) had moved their families during the credentialing stage, the women described in the sample had not. Other sorts of temporary arrangements were made. The family was portrayed by women as confining: "I'm confined to certain givens—my family. I wanted to go elsewhere to school but couldn't leave my family to do it. I've had to make certain second choices in my career because of my family. I've given up a lot of personal and social freedoms to be in a career as well as raise a family—my life is very tightly organized" (Schmuck, 1975: 342). Traditional family life was seen to limit career mobility for women.

A second difficulty for professional women in their family lives centers around problems of support. For many women traditional family life with careers has meant that they must really carry two jobs. Support received from the husband is seen as essential, and as Janet Bogdan notes in chapter 14, the role that the children play in terms of their independence and helpfulness is also important. In most homes where the woman is a professional, the man occupies similar professional status (Bailyn, 1975). Couples where both parties are professionals have until recently been described as deviant (Holmstrom, 1971). The problem of combining two professional careers and family life is lessened for women when the husband is accommodating. Women have rarely occupied the position of the "married family-free man" and have consequently found difficulties in occupational settings designed for this kind of person. As many in the women's movement have noted, "Who wouldn't want a wife?"

A third problem for women related to family life arises from what might be called problems of feminine ethics stemming from the effort to combine career and family. The person who does manage to combine both well is seen as unusual. As Janet Bogdan notes in her essay, she is often asked: "how do you do it?" reflecting social perceptions that the burden for combining a family of four children and a professional career is not only out of the ordinary, but also her responsibility, not one she shares with her husband.

One of the key aspects of this constraint is the guilt that many women must confront in their attempts to combine career and family. Again, because one's femininity is so closely related to motherhood in this society, how one performs as a mother is socially evaluated along with one's professional success. As Harold Keller notes in chapter 13, child development literature, until very recently, has almost ignored the role of the father and his effects on the growth of the child. An additional aspect of this problem relates to one of the social myths about working women. Social attitudes suggest that women who work are masculine, and so they have to explain why they want to work (Laws,

1976). Femininity must continually be proved. Again, this tension creates additional strain for the professional woman.

Constraint of Marginality

The constraint of marginality creates different kinds of pressures on women. One aspect of this constraint results from the problems caused by one's position on the edge or outside of the group. Since women who have entered male fields are often seen as outsiders, they lack acceptance by those in the mainstream and are often perceived as strange or different. Because they are outsiders they rarely have equal access to mentors as do their male colleagues in graduate school, they are often not part of the casual network of relationships formed during graduate training, and they may find themselves on the edge rather than in the middle of the professional, socialization process.

Hochschild has noted that one difficulty professional women face as marginal people is that they are partially rather than totally rejected. Their ties to other women can be cut, so they are subject to "defeminization" and their ties with male colleagues are cut, and so they are subject to "deprofessionalization." Because others reject part of their identity, they may also reject part of their own identity (Hochschild, 1973). The professional woman has to prove herself not only better than many men but also better or different from what other women are thought to be like. Hochschild's analysis followed the autobiographies of twelve successful women scientists who told their life stories at a conference on successful women in the sciences. Hochschild noted that in spite of the number of difficulties the women recounted in their lives, at the end of their stories they all said that their success was really the result of hard work and commitment and that men faced the same problems in their struggle for success. Hochschild examines why these women had difficulty identifying with other women, and what ideological and structural obstacles remained. She questions why, given the data that these women presented, they succumbed so readily to the Horatio Alger myth:

Implicit in the Horatio Alger ideology is that it is *only* a question of talent and hard work, that the contours of sex roles themselves are no obstacles, that male careers are suitable to men of moderate to extraordinary talent but suitable only to women early labeled as "extraordinary." The "exceptional woman" can then be used as a weapon against women not yet defined that way. It suggests that social movements boost only the weak and infirm. It ignores the fact that most professional women, like these, have been able to devote time to their work by giving over part of their motherhood to other (usually lower-class) women whose role remains unchanged. Buttressed by the Horatio Alger ideology, and eschewing the women's movement, deviant women

often maintain their deviance and forestall the full acceptance they seek (Hochschild, 1973: 198).

Schmuck found similar perspectives among the women in her sample, although she found attitudes changing:

It used to be when I walked into a room full of men and only one other woman I would tend to ignore her. Now when I walk into a similar situation the woman and I at least have eye-contact. I don't necessarily sit by her and I may not even talk to her, but we have a feeling of sisterhood and we support each other. There's too damn few of us (women); we found out we need to support each other. If there were more of us we would be free to act just as folks, but because there are so few of us, there is a common bond of being women (Schmuck, 1975: 351).

This issue of numbers is central to understanding the constraint of marginality. When numbers of women are so few in professional work, how does this affect their performance and behavior? In her study of women in the corporate setting Kanter (1977) suggests that many problems women face are related not to their internal psychological structure or to differential socialization processes but rather to their position in the organizational structure. For these women at or near the top, their token representation causes particular problems:

This position as "tokens" (representatives of their category rather than independent individuals) accounts for many of the difficulties such numerically scarce people face in fitting in, gaining peer acceptance, and behaving naturally. The existence of tokens encourages social segregation and stereotyping and may lead the person in that position to overcompensate through either achievement or hiding successes, or to turn against people of his or her own kind. Thus numbers—proportional representation—are important not only because they symbolize the presence or absence of discrimination but also because they have real consequences for performance (Kanter, 1977:6).

Tokens are, in other words, continually evaluated as "representatives" rather than as individuals. Because they are stand-ins for all women, when token women perform individual acts, these acts become loaded with extra symbolism because what individuals do is evaluated as a sign of how women perform. Token women, then, face special pressures. They get attention because of their high visibility, their differences are exaggerated by those in the mainstream, and they are more easily stereotyped than people found in greater proportion (Kanter, 1977).

Because tokens make oneself and others self-conscious, and because people in the mainstream often lack knowledge about the token, behaving naturally

can be difficult. In her sample, Schmuck (1975) found discomfort from both perspectives. She found that women administrators often expressed a desire to go out for a beer "with the boys" after a meeting, but anticipating an uncomfortable atmosphere, would not go. And men felt that they could not really relax when women "were an integral part of the management team." The position of token creates psychological stress for the women occupying these categories.

Another difficulty arises from the pressures caused when women violate prevalent group norms. When women attempt to succeed in fields traditionally reserved for men, they must not only face the difficulties associated with competence and talent but also struggle with being perceived as violating sex-role norms. Because women must buck cultural standards to succeed, this additional pressure demands more of them than of men in the same position. They have an added burden. The price of the additional struggle is another kind of psychological stress, internal ambivalence. How does one fight traditional career pressures as well as cultural norms and values? How does one preserve one's femininity when professional work is seen as masculine. Women either develop strategies to do so, or they lower their expectations. These issues are part of a third area of constraints that women in the professions must face.

Internal or Self-Imposed Restraints

A third area of constraints women in educational leadership must confront adds another dimension to the pressures already delineated. These might be called the internal consequences of the external situations in women's lives. These are, on one level, psychological and self-imposed.

How do women respond to social definitions of femininity? If women are defined as helpers, not as leaders, as warm and supportive, not as ambitious or initiating, what happens when in fact they seek or take on roles that run counter to traditional definitions? The literature that discusses this has examined women's aspirations, women's levels of self-confidence and ability to be risk takers, and the need for role models.

Discussions of aspirations have questioned why women do not appear to aspire to the same levels as men do. The most popular metaphors for framing these issues are fear of success and fear of failure. Marilyn Johnson, in chapter 11, examines the debate surrounding this controversial paradigm and raises some important questions. Kanter (1977) has questioned whether fear of success is not really a fear of visibility. Since many women who exhibit this syndrome are to be found in male-dominated professions, perhaps their fears are manifestations of tokenism, the lack of substantial representation in the field. And how does one's level of aspirations relate to the expectations for success held for the woman by significant others?

If one does have aspirations, where are the appropriate people after whom one can model behavior? Toni Antonucci in chapter 12 discusses the importance of role modeling for women as well as men. Researchers have indicated the importance of parents and college professors as models for young women's life choices (Steinmann, 1977; Almqvist and Angrist, 1971; Baruch, 1972). Other models important for professional women are "models of situations" (Hochschild, 1975). Where does one look, for example, for successful patterns combining marriage and a career: not to the family-free married man and not to the exceptional woman. The difficulty for women is finding models in the social context of their particular situations.

Another aspect of these self-imposed restraints relates to self-confidence and risk taking. In chapter 2 Jane Conoley examines the psychology of leadership behavior, focusing particularly on the research reports of the leadership styles of women as contrasted to men. What kinds of situations enable women to become risk takers? What support systems build women's self-confidence in their professional settings? Often, as the literature on women and volunteerism has noted, women exhibit great leadership capabilities in settings that are considered socially acceptable for women. Research has suggested, for example, that female teachers commonly take leadership positions in community activities in schools but will not do so in the community (Estler, 1975). If women do indeed pull back from taking risks, from acting on a framework of self-confidence, how does one analyze this behavior? Is it realistic, given the social context of women's lives? Is it reflective, perhaps, of the behavior of any weak persons in a social organization, rather than of women per se? These questions require substantial research.

How can these three kinds of constraints be diminished? Family constraints would be lessened through alteration of the family-career model as we know it and more generally through changes in the relationship between public and private life (Hochschild, 1975; Rossi, 1964). This perhaps would decrease the necessity of evaluating women by their ability to perform well in multiple roles. In addition, as Harold Keller suggests in chapter 13, research on child development must pay more attention to fathers (and reflect consequently, changing social values), and greater involvement of fathers with their families must be encouraged. As anthropologists have suggested, "the most egalitarian societies are not those in which male and female are opposed or are even competitors, but those in which men value and participate in the domestic life of the home" (Rosaldo, 1974: 41). These are the societies where women can become more involved in public events. Family constraints would also be diminished if occupations increased in flexibility. For women in the university, for example, the key years in the attainment of tenure usually coincide with years of having children and building a family. If women were allowed an extra year for each child they bear (up to 2 years) this might facilitate the combina-

tion of family and career (Graham, 1970). An increase in numbers of women in the professions would enable women to feel less like marginal people, would change prevalent group norms and would additionally provide role models and role situations to socialize the next generation of professionals. Finally, and most broadly, a change in the expectations women face would heighten aspirations and develop confidence.

This chapter has attempted to describe what might be called social problems that women interested in or already occupying positions of educational leadership face as they enter new arenas of professional service: issues of discrimination, problems of social organization (career-family relationships), the rigidity of the professions, tokenism. Whereas this overview also touches on some of the psychological consequences of these social programs, several chapters in this book examine these issues in much greater depth. The historical perspective is represented, in addition to Joan Burstyn's chapter, in Sally Kohlstedt's examination of the early years of Simmons College's single-sex environment as it affected leadership aspirations among its students; in Pat Haines' comparative analysis of Cornell University's coeducational impact on women students at the turn of the century; and in Margaret Gribskov's evaluation of the impact of feminism on the rise of female school administrators. Michael Freedman's chapter examines good leadership from an anthropological perspective, relating leadership qualities to the goals they serve and positing them in a social context.

The importance of examining the social context of leadership cannot be ignored. Is it possible to bring together concerns for good education for children and the abolition of sex discrimination? On the surface, these concerns may appear to have no relation. One female school administrator, lamenting the higher quality required for women to become competitive for administrative positions, suggested that women would have truly attained equality when mediocrity for women, as for men, would provide access to these jobs (Schmuck, 1975). Whereas her intent is clear, and the pernicious effects of the "superwoman" syndrome are indefensible, the benefits of mediocrity to children do not readily come to mind. Are we reduced to careerism versus quality education? On a deeper level, I think not.

First, discrimination against women in the field of educational leadership, as in other areas of life—whether economically, personally, or professionally—is a matter of social injustice. The redressing of grievances creates ever-widening concentric rings of change, which affect the society as a whole. As Frances Wright, a Scottish writer and reformer, who emigrated to America at the end of the first quarter of the nineteenth century, affirmed, "however novel it may appear, I shall venture the assertion, that, until women assume the place in society which good sense and good feeling alike assign to them, human improvement must advance but feebly" (Lerner, 1977: 224). The quality of education, as studies of racism, poverty, and sexism have made clear, reaches beyond the

limits of the classroom door. Or more appropriately, the long arm of society reaches right into the classroom. Reducing social injustices shapes the quality of the educational experience for all children.

Second, providing access to educational leadership positions for women would change the images of men and women that children in this society hold. The provision of female role models for girls, and the impact of diversity in style and personality as well, can suggest adult life-situations not previously available for many children. The possibility, then, that structural changes in the society will create internal changes in children, as well, will be enhanced.

Third, whereas social change is difficult for those people who are the explorers, the first to try and the tokens, the impact of this dissonance on social order is positive, for it creates an atmosphere in which varieties of leadership styles, the nature of good leadership, and the goals of educational leaders can be openly examined and discussed. The debate provoked, then, causes a healthy examination of the nature of the profession and of the means of access to it. As people discuss the pool from which leaders are drawn, questions about the teaching profession itself will necessarily be raised. And again, the quality of education as a whole comes into focus.

The interdisciplinary nature of this book suggests how broad are the foundations upon which questions of educational leadership for women rest. Overriding questions of power and ideology (chapter 3, for example), how children are socialized in school (chapter 9), and models for change (chapters 15 and 16) all come under examination. The settings examined range from institutions of higher education (chapter 12) to public schools and school districts (chapters 8 and 10), to the family (chapters 13 and 14). If more women are to become educational leaders, society will have to change. The dimensions of the issues discussed in this book are indeed far-reaching.

Notes

1. My thanks to Joan N. Burstyn for her perceptive comments on this essay.

2. Social scientists have characterized differences in autonomy, level of creativity, and intrinsic job interest as dividing the professions from the semi-professions. Are these differences as total and widespread as is indicated? Perhaps for the gross majority of professional lawyers and doctors, for example, their daily routines are as inflexible and as controlled as teachers' lives. Comparing "cream-of-the-crop" lawyers to those who make their living largely from house closings might suggest differences in the levels of routinization within the ranks of the law. Is there a difference, again, between those who are paid on a fee-for-service basis and salaried workers within the profession

itself? My thanks to Julia Loughlin, sociologist at Syracuse University, for this insight.

References

- Almquist, E.M., and Angrist, S.S. "Role Model Influence on College Career Aspirations." *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly* 17 (1971): 263-279.
- Azzarelli, J. "Four Viewpoints." In *Struggle for Power in Education*, edited by F.W. Lutz and J.J. Azzarelli, pp. 1-15. New York: Center for Research in Education, 1966.
- Bailyn, L. "Family Constraints on Women's Work." In *Women and Work*, edited by Ruth Kundsinn, pp. 94-102. New York: William Morrow, 1975.
- Baruch, G.K. "Maternal Influence upon College Women's Attitudes toward Women and Work." *Developmental Psychology* 6 (1972): 32-37.
- Beecher, C. *True Remedy for the Wrongs of Women*. Boston: Phillips, 1851.
- Butts, R.F. and Cremin, L. *A History of Education in American Culture*. New York: Henry Holt, 1953.
- Caplow, T. *The Sociology of Work*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1954.
- Charters, W.W., Jr. "The Social Background of Teaching." In *Handbook of Research on Teaching*, edited by N.L. Gage, pp. 715-813. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963.
- Clarke, E. *Sex in Education*. Boston: Houghton, Osgood, 1974.
- Clement, J. *Sex Bias in School Leadership*. Evanston, Ill.: Integrated Publishing Associates, 1975.
- Cott, N.F. *The Bonds of Womanhood*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1977.
- Cox, S., ed. *Female Psychology*. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1935.
- Curti, M. *The Social Ideas of American Educators*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935.
- Dalton, M. *Men Who Manage*. New York: Wiley, 1959.
- Denmark, F. "Styles of Leadership." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* (Winter 1977): 99-113.
- Edwards, N., and Richey, H. *The School in the American Social Order*. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1947.
- Epstein, C.F. "Bringing Women in: Rewards, Punishments, and the Problem of Achievement." In *Women and Success*, edited by Ruth Kundsinn, pp. 13-21. New York: William Morrow, 1975.
- Estler, S. "Women as Leaders in Public Education." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 1 (1975): 363-386.
- Etzioni, A., ed. *The Semi-Professions and Their Organization*. New York: Free Press, 1969.

- Fischel, A., and Pottker, J. "Performance of Women Principals: A Review of Behavior and Attitudinal Studies." In *Sex Bias in the Schools: The Research Evidence*, edited by A. Fischel and J. Pottker, pp. 289-299. Rutherford, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University, 1977.
- Graham, P. "Women in Academe." *Science*, 169 (25 September 1970): 3952.
- Hall, O. "The Social Structure of the Teaching Profession." In *Struggle for Power in Education*, edited by F.W. Lutz and J.J. Azzarelli, pp. 35-48. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1966.
- Hochschild, A.R. "Making It: Marginality and Obstacles to Minority Consciousness." In *Successful Women in the Sciences: An Analysis of Determinants*, edited by Ruth Kundsinn. New York: Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, Vol. 208, 1973. Reprinted with permission.
- . "Inside the Clockwork of Male Careers." In *Women and the Power to Change*, edited by Florence Howe, pp. 47-80. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Holmstrom, L.L. "Career Patterns of Married Couples." In *The Professional Woman*, edited by Athena Theodore, pp. 516-535. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman, 1971.
- Howe, F. ed. *Women and the Power to Change*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Kanter, R.M. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books, 1977.
- Kundsinn, R. ed. *Women and Success*. New York: William Morrow, 1973.
- Laws, J.L. "Work Aspiration of Women: False Leads and New Starts." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 1 (1976): part 2: Women and the Workplace, 33-49.
- Lerner, G., ed. *The Female Experience: An American Documentary*. Indianapolis, Ind.: Bobbs-Merrill, 1977.
- Lieberman, M. *Education as a Profession*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1956.
- . Editorial. *Phi Delta Kappan* 55 (October 1973): 98.
- Lightfoot, S.L. "Family-School Interactions: The Cultural Image of Mothers and Teachers." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 3 (1977): 395-408.
- Lockheed, M., ed. *Research on Women's Acquisition of Professional and Leadership Roles*. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1975.
- Lortie, D. "The Balance of Control and Autonomy in Elementary School." In *The Semi-Professions and Their Organization*, edited by A. Etzioni, pp. 1-53. New York: Free Press, 1969.
- . *School-Teacher*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.
- Lyon, C. and Saario, T.N. "Women in Public Education: Sexual Discrimination in Promotions." *Phi Delta Kappan* 55 (October 1973): 120-123.
- National Conference on Women in Education Policy Making. *Hierarchy, Power,*

- and Women in Educational Policy Making*. Washington, D.C. Leadership Training Institute, 1975.
- National Education Association. *26th Biennial Salary and Staff Survey of Public School Professional Personnel 1972-1973*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1973.
- O'Leary, V. "Some Attitudinal Barriers to Occupational Aspirations in Women." *Psychological Bulletin* 81 (1974): 809-826.
- Rebecca, M.; Hefner, R.; and Oleshansky, B. "A Model of Sex-Role Transcendence." *Journal of Social Issues* 32 (1976): 197-206.
- Rosaldo, M. "Women, Culture and Society: A Theoretical Overview." In *Women, Culture and Society*, edited by M. Rosaldo and L. Lamphere, pp. 17-42. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University, 1974.
- Rossi, A. "Equality between the Sexes: An Immodest Proposal." In *The Woman in America*, edited by R.J. Lifton, pp. 98-143. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1964.
- Schmuck, P. "Deterrents to Women's Careers in School Management." *Sex Roles* 1 (1975): 339-353. Reprinted with permission.
- Sells, L. "Sex and discipline differences in professional socialization." In *Research on Women's Acquisition of Professional and Leadership Roles*. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1975, pp. 18-43.
- Silver, P. "Women in Educational Leadership: A Trend Discussion." In *Trends in Education Series*. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1976.
- Simpson, R.L. and Simpson, I.H. "Women and Bureaucracy in the Semi-Professions." In *The Semi-Professions and Their Organization*, edited by A. Etzioni, pp. 196-265. New York: Free Press, 1969.
- Steinmann, A. "Female-Role Perception as a Factor in Counseling." In *Sex Bias in the Schools*, edited by J. Pottker and A. Fischel, pp. 230-238. Rutherford, N.J.: Fairleigh Dickinson University, 1977.
- Tavris, C. and Offir, C. *The Longest War*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1977.
- Theodore, A., ed. *The Professional Woman*. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman, 1971.
- Tyack, D. *The One Best System*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974.
- Waller, W. *Sociology of Teaching*. New York: John Wiley, 1932.
- Woody, T. *A History of Women's Education in the United States*. New York: Octagon Books, 1966. (2 vols., original published by Science Press, 1929).