Full Length Research Paper

Perceptions of School Leaders: Exploring School Climate Data Based on Principal Gender and Student Achievement

Joe D. Nichols and Get W. Nichols

Joe Nichols: Indiana University - Purdue University at Fort Wayne, email: nicholsj@ipfw.edu
Get Nichols: Fort Wayne Community Schools Corporation

This project explored the climate data of 33 elementary schools in an urban school system to determine the relationship among perceptions of effective school leadership and student achievement. Data was compiled from teachers (n = 847) at each elementary school in regard to their perceptions of effective leadership of their school principal. Data was compared to student achievement and disaggregated based upon the gender of the principal. In summary, female principals were rated significantly lower on their leadership skills than male principals by their staff. In contrast, when student standardized test data were explored and cross-referenced with the gender of the principal, student achievement at schools with female leadership was comparable with that of elementary sites with male leadership.

Introduction

Throughout time, stereotypes of women and men have permeated society, resulting in the creation of obstacles for women in the professional world. Words like nurturing, compassionate, emotional, expressive, communal, passive, uncertain, subjective, and supportive have historically been used to describe women, while words like intelligent, powerful, competent, objective, independent, methodical, and driven have typically been reserved to describe men (Porat, 1991). These types of adjectives from a societal perspective have supported the social perception that men are superior and women are inferior (Stufft & Coyne, 2009), particularly in leadership roles. This perception creates a particularly significant hurdle for women in educational leadership positions where their underrepresentation as secondary school principals and in the superintendency provides a dismal social commentary on long-standing gender inequities.

The central issues regarding school leadership and the white-male dominance in this position does not simply revolve around gender disparity. Continued underrepresentation of men and women of color in school leadership roles continues to be pervasive. Limited research exists that explores minority men and women leaders' lived experiences and fewer studies exist beyond limited self-report or anecdotal comments. Data on school leadership among African American, Asian American, Native American, Hispanic and other non-traditional categories of men and women are virtually non-existent (Wrushen & Sherman 2008). What small body of research that does exist certainly begins to suggest that these diverse leaders' struggle for visibility and recognition as school leaders is impacted by their family, cultures, spiritual backgrounds, and the complexity of how gender, race, economic class, and/or sexuality creates a tension of struggle and a balance of duality (Alston, 2005; Jackson, 1999; Grogan, 2000; Marshall, 1999). Although each of these underrepresented groups of school leaders merit considerable space in the literature, if we explore gender specifically for this project as a valid way of looking at leadership, (Blount, 1998; Brunner & Grogan, 2007; Grogan, 2000; Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2011; Tallerico, 2000), we then need to draw from the specific experience of women in those roles.

The purpose of this project was to explore the climate survey data of 33 elementary schools in a large urban school system along with student academic achievement data to determine the relationship between faculty perceptions of effective school leadership (disaggregated by gender) and student achievement. Specifically, questionnaire data was complied from teachers at each elementary school in the system in regard to their

perceptions and opinions of the leadership effectiveness of their current school principal. This data was compared to student achievement data and disaggregated based upon the gender of the principal at each school site.

Literature Review

One of the most interesting 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 (Bilken & Brannigan, 1980, p.2). These phenomena encourage a social perception that men are have the potential capability to be superior leaders while women are inferior and lack these skills due to their "softer" characteristics.

Despite Ella Flagg Young's (the first female superintendent of the Chicago Public Schools) prediction in 1909 that in 100 years, more women than men would be leading schools and school systems, conflicting information continues to fail to adequately describe these numbers. The Digest of Educational Statistics (2004) reported that less than 5 % of public school superintendents are women and less than 27% of public and secondary school principals are women. According the US Department of Education in 1997, women held 34% of public school principalships in 1994. Synder and Hoffman (2002) reported that in 1999 and 2000, the representation of women in public school principalships had increased to 44%. More recent compilations of this type of data (Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2011) have found that women now comprise 50.3% of all elementary and secondary principalships and 21.7% of superintendent positions. Of these numbers, 58.9% of the female principalships are at the elementary level while 28.5% are at the secondary level. Despite the clear fact that a career in teaching remains a feminized profession with almost 80% of the teaching staffs being female, school administration continues to be dominated by males specifically at the elementary and superintendency levels, making this disparity one of education's most challenging issues (Dana & Bourisaw, 2006a).

Sex-role socialization partially explains the history of women's work in schools, specifically in educational administration (Chafetz, 1990; Edson, 1988; Reskin & Padavic, 1994). Many would suggest that women have not broken into the ranks of educational leadership because the institutions (i.e., family, schools and churches) that have contributed to their socialization process also have stood as their greatest barriers (Noel-Batiste, 2009). Goal oriented women have sought to move into leadership roles but have not been able to overcome the stereotypes and stigmas of a culture that consciously or unconsciously, believes that women in education are best suited for the classroom. Many (Brunner & Grogan, 2007; Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2011; Kruger, 2008; Wrushen and Sherman, 2008) have suggested that there is a definite pattern of gender division and labor in education and concluded that women have not made significant gains in educational administration because

their "femaleness" appeared to be problematic in an area dominated by men.

The biological basis for differences between men and women has become increasingly clear in recent years with the debate of nature-nurture continuing the discussion between genes and the environment. In the world of school leadership, differences between men and women and their specific leadership styles and characteristics is becoming increasingly important as the principal's role has become progressively more complicated. Grogan and Shakeshaft (2011) provide some of the most recent explorations of these issues as the body of research that has examined female leadership suggests several components that are commonly associated with women leaders. Based on women's lived experiences of leading school and districts, Grogan and Shakeshaft's work examines consistent themes in female leadership and how men and women have similar and also quite different interactions with their staff and students.

Unique to women leaders, Grogan and Shakeshaft (2011) identified the qualities of relational leadership, leadership of social justice, spiritual leadership, leadership for learning, and balanced leadership as key departures from traditional male leadership themes. Relational leadership suggests that leadership is about being in relationships with others in a horizontal rather than hierarchical sense. Planning and goal accomplishment is approached with others rather through others. Grogan (2000) and Bruner (2000) have both identified relational power as something that increases as it is shared and that power used to help others strengthens relationships, while power used to control damages relationships. Women who enact this relationship leadership strategy tend to use decision making strategies that allow them to really hear input from others. In essence, relational leadership is about facilitating the work of others who share the power and authority to collaboratively craft direction for the school building or district (Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2011).

Women leaders are more likely to report that they enter the field of education because they wanted to change the status quo. Women, more often than men identify educational careers as social justice work and their commitment to social justice as a motivator and continuing mission is well documented (Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2011; Sanders-Lawson, Smith-Campbell, & Beckham, 2006; Shapiro, 2004; Strachan, 2002). Social justice therefore, to women leaders means a passion for doing work that involves making a difference in the lives of children who have not been well-served by the current system. If the goal of leadership and change is to bring about greater social justice as an end product for women leaders, then hope, spirituality, and a belief in a superior being is the motivation that encourages their pursuit of leadership positions (Lips & Kenner, 2007; Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2011).

The idea of leadership grounded in spirituality is a strong theme found in research on women leaders – particularly within the comments of women of color (Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2011; Bailey, Koney, McNish, Powers, & Uhly, 2008; Simmons &

Johnson, 2008). More so than men, many women leaders draw on their religious beliefs to understand the impact of spirituality in their lives as school leaders (Curry, 2001; Dillard, 2006; Ngunjiri, 2010). Both women of color and white female administrators discuss the relationship between spirituality and the ways they model their behavior and inspire others (Grogan & Shakshaft, 2011). Additionally, these women acknowledge the importance of their spirituality to their success and ability to move forward despite conflicts and difficult situations. Many women in educational leadership positions report that it is their spirituality that gives them hope, increasing their resilience to effect positive change in their school systems or buildings (Simmons & Johnson, 2008). Also tied to the spiritual aspect of leadership for women is a sense of commitment to improving educational service and that the focus should be on children and their learning (Oplatka & Mimon, 2008). Brunner and Grogan (2007) have established that women leaders in education spend much more time in the classroom than their male counterparts and therefore they are highly moved to make changes to create better learning opportunities as a result of the spiritual and moral criteria of the leadership role.

A number of studies note that instruction and learning-focused leadership is central to women school leaders (Beck & Murphy, 1996). Women leaders are much more likely to introduce and support strong programs in staff development, to encourage innovation, and to experiment with instructional approaches. They are also more likely to focus on the importance of instructional competence in teachers and to be more attentive to task completion with instructional programs (Grogan & Shakeshaft, 2011). By placing instruction and learning at the center of their leadership focus and mission, women leaders are more likely to push for instructional change that improves learning. Their decisions based on the priorities of student learning allow them to acknowledge that schools must be managed well, but the focus on collaborative efforts to gain student growth and development are a priority. Court (2005) has also suggested that examples of co-leadership that emphasizes collaborative planning and collective vision-making is an attribute that women leaders enjoy and embrace. Brunner and Grogan (2007) also have found that female superintendents, who often served as district leaders for curriculum and instruction before they reached the superintendency, were twice as likely as male superintendents to participate in professional development activities since their leadership goals focus on curriculum, teaching and learning.

Balanced leadership is the final theme that Grogan and Shakshaft (2011) have identified as a critical component that women in educational leadership find important. As Grogan has reported earlier (1996), many women leaders in education essentially manage two lives: one managing a household, and one managing a school or district. Similar to men, women experience the day-to-day activities of leading a school or district as a consuming experience. Unlike men however, many women leaders report extensive additional work when they go home as they continue to maintain the majority of traditional family and home responsibilities. Women leaders desire to manage both work and home duties without the support of other family members and this consistent theme is prevalent in the research literature (Bruner, 2000; Mendez-Morse, 2004; Smith-Campbell, 2002). Although studies have reported the struggles women leaders experience with balancing family and work (Gupton & Slick, 1996), some women leaders have suggested that learning to balance these dimensions can actually enhance their performance.

In a recent study by Noel-Batiste (2009), more than 80% of the respondents (208 female school administrators) to a questionnaire reported that women did not have the geographic mobility to improve their carrier opportunities. Eighty-four percent of the respondents stated that women are still perceived in stereotyped roles and 80% stated that the "good old boy system" is still alive and well in school administration.

Would-be women leaders have to cope with persistent images of male dominance and often, the only professional literature on female leadership consists largely of information gathered by male policy makers or male administrators at several levels of leadership within the educational structure (Green, 2000). Grogan and Henry (1995) studied the relationship between school boards and women superintendent candidates and found that the superintendency continues to be constructed in a male arena. They also suggested that a warrior, military, or business mentality predominates conceptions of effective superintendents and indicate that these androcentric perceptions disadvantage women superintendent candidates. Cherryholmes (1988) has suggested that professions are constituted by what is said and done in their name and that consistencies in what is said and done are based on shared beliefs and values. Consistent with this is the notion that male power holders in a given community (schools) are a dominant force, and the position of school leadership is viewed as powerful and masculine, so a woman wishing to move into leadership positions must define and use power in the same way as the community's male power holders in the past (Bruner, 1999). Mainstream literature surrounding school leadership has historically been grounded in masculine theories of motivation and management (Hertzberg, 1968; Sergiovanni, 1967), with little emphasis on sociocultural or feminist theories of leadership (Dillard, 1995). The power of a feminist lens that explores the struggles of women leaders makes it possible to focus on the gaps and blank spaces in male-dominant culture, knowledge, and behavior (Bruner, 1999; Gosetti & Rusch, 1995; Murphey, Moss, Hannah & Wiener, 2005).

Research by Lips and others (Carli, 2001; Eagly, Makhijani & Klonsky, 1992; Lips, 2000, 2003; Lott, 1985; Rudman,1998) suggest the following: Competent women may be viewed as unfeminine; women who have a no-nonsense, autocratic, directive leadership style are judged more harshly than men with a similar leadership style; when women do exercise authority or behave in competent or directive ways, they may receive negative evaluations because they have violated the

feminine stereotype; women who promote their own competence are judged less likable than men who do the same; and women who act in such highly assertive, confident, or competent ways sometimes find that their ability to influence others, particularly males, is reduced (Dana & Bourisaw, 2006). Because of the cultural conditioning of gender roles for men and women, women who can be an authoritarian and directive choose to have "power with" their superiors, peers and subordinates, rather than "power over them" (Lips, 2003).

Methodology

This project explored quantitative school climate survey responses of elementary teachers on 5- point Likert- type scale anchored by strongly agree (5) and strongly disagree (1) that were provided by the school corporation to the authors. A growing body of research has confirmed the importance of the learning climate for children and adolescents. Empirical research has also shown that a positive and sustained school climate promotes students' academic success and healthy development. Positive school climates have also been show to promote greater teacher retention which in itself promotes greater student success (Center for Social and Emotional Education, 2007; National School Climate Council, 2007; Zins, Weissberg, Wang & Walberg, 2004). Data was compiled from teachers (n = 847) at each elementary school in regard to their perceptions of the effective leadership of their school principal. Although parents and students also completed this climate survey, this project only explored those responses provide by the teachers in regard to their perceptions of the effectiveness of their current principal. This data was compared to student achievement data available through the state department of education web-site, compared for accuracy against the local school's student testing data, and then disaggregated and explored using comparative inquiry techniques based upon the gender of the principal at each school site.

The data sources for this project stem from a school climate survey that was distributed during the 2008-2009 school year at the 33 elementary schools of a large urban school system in the Midwest portion of the United States. This school system includes an enrollment of just over 31,000 students. Sixty-eight percent of these students are eligible to receive free or reduced-price meals while the ethnic breakdown for this school system is 50% Caucasian, 25% African American, 13% Hispanic, 4% Asian American. More than 75 different languages are spoken in this school system. Elementary school teachers in this system responded to 15 items relating to their building's student atmosphere, communication with parents, in-service opportunities, personal growth, peer support, vision and student outcomes, and their perceptions of the principal's leadership ability (See Table 1). Teachers completing this survey totaled 847 of the total of 1091 eligible for a response rate of approximately 78%.

Table 1 *School Climate Teacher Survey Items*

1. The vision for the district is clear.
2. The vision for the school is clear.
3. My Principal facilitates communication effectively.
4. My Principal is an effective instructional leader.
5. My Principal treats me with respect.
6. As peers, we teachers treat each other with respect.
7. I have the opportunity to participate in in-service sessions that meet my needs.
8. I can learn a lot from my professional peers
9. I communicate with parents often about class activities.
10. Students are safe at this school.
11. The school provides an atmosphere where every student can succeed.
12. Quality work is expected of all students at this school.
13. I believe that improving my instructional practice will improve student achievement.
14. The student outcomes for my classes are clear to my students.
15. This is a good school.

Annual standardized test scores required by the state for all students completing the annual state exam at each school site were also gathered as indicators of academically successful schools versus those that were below the state benchmarks for adequate yearly progress (AYP) for this specific year. The percentage of all students at each school site that passed both the mathematics and English portion of the state exam were explored along with the socio-economic status of each school site based upon the percentage of students qualifying for free or reduced lunch.

Results

To confirm what much of the literature states in regard to the relationship between student achievement and low socio-economic status, the percentage of students at each school site passing both portions of the state exam were matched with the percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunch. A significant negative correlation was observed with $r = -.83$, $p < .01$, suggesting the strong negative relationship between test scores and socio-economic status. In effect, the greater the percentage of free and reduced lunch students at each school site, the lower the student passing rate on the annual standardized exam.

Table 2 provides average teacher responses on the climate survey for schools with male leadership (principals) and Table 3 provides demographic data for these schools that includes the average age of the faculty, the percent of female teachers in the building, the percentage of students at each building passing both the math and English portions of the state standardized exam, the percentage of each buildings' student population

receiving free or reduced lunch, and the percentage of students designated as belonging to a minority class as defined by the school corporation. Tables 4 and 5 provide this same data for schools with female leadership (principals).

For the items on the school climate survey that measured effective leadership as indicated by their staff, male principals (n = 16) averaged 4.25 and female principals (n = 18) averaged 3.95, suggesting a significant difference based on a t-test comparison of these means t = 7.89, p < .05. Five female principals averaged above 4.0 on the 5-point Likert scale on the items that were explored while 12 male principals averaged above 4.0. Despite the fact that 88% of the teacher respondents were female, male principals were rated as more effective leaders overall when compared to their female principal counterparts.

For the five highly rated female principals on the climate survey (above 4.0), the percentage of students at their school site passing both portions of the state assessment test averaged 54.98%. For the twelve highly rated male principals on the climate survey (above 4.0), students at the school site passing both portions of the state exam averaged 54.78% (no significant difference). When comparing male and female principals that were low-rated leaders (below 4.0), low- rated female principals' (n = 12) students passed both portions of the state exam at an average rate of 53.3% while low rated male principals' (n = 4) students passed both portions of the state exam at an average rate of 51.6% (again no significant difference). In summary, although students in this corporation passed the state exam at an equal rate regardless of the gender of the principal or the teacher perceptions of the principals' leadership, perceptions of female principals by the teachers at their school sites were significantly lower than male principals.

When the data that included the percentage of students who received free or reduced lunch were explored, it was discovered that for school sites with 80% or more of its students with this designation, eight of these schools had female principals and only 1 had a male principal. The passing rates for the standardized exam for the eight low income schools with female leadership was 41.3% compared to 42.3% for the one low income school with male leadership.

Discussion and Conclusion

The literature is clear regarding the overrepresentation of male leadership in schools, particularly at the secondary level and in the superintendency. While female teachers represent the overall teaching population in the classroom setting (in this school corporation 88% of respondents at the elementary school sites were female), males continue to dominate leadership roles that include the school principalship and superintendency. Understanding the significance of the "glass-ceiling" effect and the struggles of female leaders within our schools continues to be important to explore. There are gender specific assumptions regarding female administrators' ability and competence to perform the role (Shakeshaft, 1987). Along

with these stereotypes, the lack of necessities including adequate childcare and support systems (Scutt, 1990), mentoring opportunities, lack of support and counseling from family and friends and coworkers (Anastaski & Koutra, 2005), and the view that leadership is unfeminine (Lips & Kenner, 2007), places women in the unfortunate position of neglecting their natural feminine role expectations to foster their leadership role expectations (Stuff & Coyne, 2009).

When women do eventually move into leadership positions, particularly in male dominated areas, they tend to be judged more harshly than their male counterparts (Eagly, Makhijani, & Klonsky, 1992) and coworkers are more tolerant of dominant behavior in men than in women, who are often penalized for exhibiting their power (Carli, 2001). As suggested in the results of this project, females in leadership positions who are highly competent are often judged less likable than men who exhibit the same behaviors (Rudman, 1998).

In the case of this project, the results are clear in that students at school sites with male or female principals scored consistently the same on state exams. However, the perceptions of the effective leadership of female principals as rated by their teachers and staff were significantly less than their male counterparts in the principalship. These findings support the earlier work of researchers who continue to explore the prejudice and bias of male versus female leadership (Carli, 2001; Dana & Bourisaw, 2006b; Lipps, 2003; Murphey et al., 2005; Stufft & Coyne, 2009), and the obstacles that females must continually overcome to be perceived as effective leaders in schools.

The results of the study also support the earlier findings of Lips (2000), Carli (2001) and others that suggested that women in leadership roles may be viewed as less competent than male leaders with similar leadership styles and are often judged more harshly than men with comparable leadership traits. If women have violated the feminine stereotype by being strong, assertive, confident, and autocratic, they may often be judged as less likable than men who exhibit the same characteristics (Lips, 2003), despite the fact that at least in this project, student academic success rates are approximately the same. In essence, female principals were overall rated as less effective by their building teachers and staff then male principals, even though student success was comparable.

Although it may be a unique finding with this particular school corporation, the observation of a large number of female principals assigned to low income schools is important to consider. Low income or Title 1 school student populations present unique challenges above and beyond the central focus of attempting to raise student test scores. Working with parents from low income or poverty line backgrounds, working with families of single parent homes, student populations with high percentages of limited English skills, and working with students the school community.

Students with lower socio-economic status tend to have lower academic achievement, higher drop-out rates, and tend to fall further behind academically as they progress through grade levels (Farkas, 2008; Lee & Bowen, 2006; Sirin, 2005). The question to consider given the research that explores the difficult challenges of working with low income populations and the fact that women in leadership roles are often seen as less capable, is the one of the potential of overrepresentation of female leadership in some of the most challenging school settings. In the case of this corporation, 8 of the 9 elementary schools with low economic student populations had women in leadership roles. Although higher socioeconomic school settings pose their own unique challenges, the issue of placing women in leadership roles in some of the most challenging schools in comparison to the placement of male leadership warrants further exploration.

Women, specifically in the elementary school setting, remain a dominate force in the teaching ranks and continue to have growing opportunities to provide leadership to these schools in the form of the principalship. Less than 27% of public and secondary school principals are women (Digest of Educational Statistics, 2004) and females in the role of school leadership will continue to struggle to overcome stereotypes and stigmas of a culture that directly or indirectly believes that women in education are best suited for the classroom. Certainly the results of this study indicate that women in the role of school principal are as capable and can have as strong of an impact on student achievement as men in a similar role, but their impact on school climate as reported by their immediate staff warrants continued exploration in the future. In addition, placing an overwhelming number of women in leadership roles at low socioeconomic school sites where student and family struggles are even more of a challenge, constitutes further examination of the feminization of the educational profession where women continually are stereotyped to be more adept as compassionate nurturers rather than effective instructional leaders.

References

Alston, J. A. (2005). Climbing hills and mountains: Black feminists making it to the superintendency. In *Sacred Dreams: Women and the superintendency*, C. C. Bruner (Ed), 79-80. Albany, NY: SUNY.

Anastasaki, A. & Koutra, C. (2005). The gender issues in the teacher's professional development. *Journal of Science Education, 6*, 44-46.

Bailey, D., Koney, K. M., McNish, M. E., Powers, R., & Uhley, K. (2008). *Sustaining our spirits: Women leaders thriving for today and tomorrow*. Washington, DC: NSAW Press.

Beck, L. G. & Murphy, J. (1996). *The four imperatives of a successful school*. Corwin Press.

Biklen, S. K. & Brannigan, L. (1980). *Women and educational leadership*. Heath Publishing, Lexington. MA.

Blount, J. M. (1998). *Destined to rule the schools. Women and the superintendency, 1873-1995*. SUNY Press, Albany, NY.

Bruner, C.C. (1999). *Sacred dreams: Women and the superintendency*. SUNY Press, Albany, NY.

Bruner, C. C. (2000). *Principles of power: Women superintendents and the riddle of the heart*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Bruner, C. C. & Grogan, M. (2007). *Women leading school systems*. Rowman & Littlefield: Lanham, MD.

Carli, L. L. (2001). Gender and social influence. *Journal of Social Issues, 57* (4), 725-741.

Center for Social and Emotional Education (2007). Retrieved 7-1-2011 from htttp://schoolclimate.org/programs/si.php.

Chafetz, J. (1990). *Gender equity: An integrated theory of stability and change*. Sage: CA.

Cherryholmes, C. H. (1988). *Power and criticism: Poststructural investigations in education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Court, M. (2005). Negotiating and reconstructing gendered leadership discourses. In J. Collard & C. Reynolds (Eds.), *Leadership, gender and culture in education* (pp. 3-17). New York: Open University Press

Curry, B. K. (2001). *Women in power*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press

Dana, J. A. & Bourisaw, D. M. (2006a). *Women in the superintendency*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Dana, J. A. & Bourisaw, D. M. (2006b). *Women in the superintendency: Discarded leadership*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Digest of Educational Statistics (2004). National Association for Educational Statistics. Washington, DC.

Dillard, C. B. (1995). Leading with her life: An African American feminist (re) interpretation of leadership for an urban high school principal. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 31* (4), 539-563.

Dillard, C. B. (2006). *On spiritual strivings*. Albany, NY: SUNY.

Eagly, A. H., Makhigini, M. G. and Kolonsky, B. K. (1992). Gender and the evaluation of leaders: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 111* (1), 3-22.

Edson, S. K. (1988). *Pushing the limits: The female administrative aspirant*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Farkas, G. (2008). Quantitative studies of oppositional culture: Arguments and evidence. In J. U. Ogbu (Ed.), *Minority status, oppositional culture and schooling* (pp. 312-347). New York, NY: Routledge.

Gosetti, P. P. & Rusch, E. (1995). Reexamining educational leadership: Challenging assumptions. In D. Dunlap, D. and P. Schmuck (eds.) *Women leading education*. Albany, NY.: State University of New York Press.

Green, M. (2000). *Women in power: Pathways to leadership in education*. Forward in B. Curry's text, Women in power: Pathways: Pathways to leadership in education. New York, NY: Teachers College Press

Grogan, M. (1996). *Voices of women aspiring to the superintendency*. Albany, NY: SUNY.

Grogan, M. (2000). Laying the groundwork for a reconception of the superintendency from feminist/postmodern

perspectives. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 35*(4), 518-536.

Grogan, M., & Henry, M. (1995). Women candidates for the superintendency: Board perspectives. In B. Irby and G. Brown (eds.) *Women as school executives: Voice and visions*. Austin, TX: Texas Council for Women School Executives.

Grogan, M. & Shakeshaft, C. (2011). *Women and educational leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Gupton, S. & Slick, G. (1996). *Highly successful women administrators: The inside stories of how they got there*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Hertzberg, F. (1968). One more time: How do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review 46*:53.

Jackson, B. L. (1999). Getting inside history – Against all odds: Black women school superintendents: *In Sacred dreams: Women and the superintendency*, C. C. Bruner (Ed.). 141-59. Albany, NY: SUNY.

Kruger, M. L. (2008). School leadership, sex, and gender: Welcome to difference. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 11*(2), 155-168.

Lee, J. S., & Bowen, N. K. (2006). Parent involvement, cultural capital, and the achievement gap among elementary and school children. *American Educational Research Journal, 43*, 193-218.

Lips, H. M. (2003). *A new psychology of women*. Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.

Lips, H. M. (2000). College students' visions of power and possibility as mediated by gender. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 24* (1), 37-41.

Lips, H. M. & Kenner, E. (2007). Effects of gender and dominance on leadership emergence: Incentives make a difference. *Sex Roles, 56*, 563-571.

Lott, B. (1985). The devaluation of women's competence. *Journal of Social Issues, 41*(4), 43-60.

Marshall, C. (1999). Researching the margins: Feminist critical policy analysis. *Educational Policy, 13*(1), 59-76.

Méndez-Morse, S. (2004). Constructing mentors: Latina educational leaders' role models and mentors. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 40*(4), 561-590.

Murphey, K., Moss, G., Hannah, S., & Wiener, R. (2005, October). Women in educational leadership: Finding common ground. *Journal of Women in Educational Leadership, 3* (4), 273-284.

National School Climate Council. (2007). The school climate challenge: Narrowing the gap between school climate research and school climate policy, practice guidelines ad teacher education policy. New York: Center for Social and Emotional Educatoin; & Denver, CO: National Center for Learning and Citizenship, Education Commission of the States. Retrieved 7-19-2011 from http://csee.net/climate/aboutcsee/school_climate_challenge.pdf.

Ngunijiri, F. W. (2010). *Women's spiritual leadership in Africa*. Albany: NY: SUNY.

Noel-Batiste, L. (2009). The perceptions of female school leaders of the obstacles and enablers that affected their career paths to educational administration. *Academic Leadership, 7*(1), 1-2.

Oplatka, I. & Mimon, R. (2008). Women principals' conceptions of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction: An alternative view. *International Journal of Leadership in Education, 11*(2), 135-153.

Porat, L. (1991). Women in Administration: The Difference is Positive. *Clearinghouse*, *64* (6), 412.

Reskin, B. & Padavic, I. (1994). *Women and men at work*. CA: Pine Forge.

Reynolds, C. (2002). *Women and school leadership: International perspectives*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Rudman, L. A. (1998). Self promotion as a risk factor for women. The costs and benefits of counter-stereotypical impression management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 629-645.

Sanders-Lawson, R., Smith-Campbell, S., & Benham, M. K. P. (2006). *Wholistic visioning for social justice: Black women theorizing practice*. In C. Marshall & M. Oliva (Eds.), Leadership for social justice. New York: Pearson Education.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1967). Factors which affect satisfaction and dissatisfaction of teachers. *Journal of Educational Administration, 5*, 66-82.

Shakeshaft, C. (1987). *Women in educational administration*. Beverly Hills , CA : Sage.

Shapiro, L. (2004). *Disrupting what is going on: Women educational leaders make art together to transform themselves and their schools*. Doctoral dissertation. Union Institute and University.

Simmons, J. M. & Johnson, W. Y. (2008). African American female superintendents speaking the language of hope: Reconstructing the multi-dimensions of passion. In W. Hoy & M. DiPaola (Eds.), *Improving schools: Studies in leadership and culture* (pp. 223-249). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Sirin, S. R. (2005). Socioeconomic status and academic achievement: A meta-analytic review of research. *Review of Educational Research, 75*, 417-453.

Simmons, J. M. and Johnson, W. Y. (2008). African American female superintendents speaking the language of hope: Reconstructing the multi-dimensions of passion. In W. Hoy & M. DiPaola (Eds.), *Improving schools: Studies in leadership and culture* (pp. 223-249). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.

Smith-Campbell, S. I. (2002). *Exploring the world of Black women middle school principals*. Doctoral dissertation. Michigan State University.

Snyder, T. D., and Hoffman, C. M. (2003). *Digest of Education Statistics 2002* (NCES 2003–060). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Strachan, J. (2002). Feminist educational leadership: Not for the fainthearted. In C. Reynolds (Ed.), *Women and school leadership*. Albany, NY: SUNY.

Stufft, D. & Coyne, K. (2009). *Educational leadership: Where are the women?* Advancing women in leadership journal, 29(11). Retrevied 7-18-2011 from http://advancingwomen.com/awl/awl_wordpress/.

Talerico, M. (2000). *Accessing the superintendency: The unwritten rules*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Wrushen, B. R. & Sherman, W. H. (2008). Women secondary school principals: Multicultural voices from the field. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 21*(5), 457-469.

Zins, J., Weissberg, R. W., Wang, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (2004). *Building school success on social emotional learning: What does the research say?* New York: Teachers College Press.

Appendix

Table 2

Climate Survey Average Teacher Responses for Elementary Schools with Male Leadership

School	District Vision	School Vision	Eff. Comm.	Eff. Inst.	Prin. Resp.	Peer Resp.	Prof. Dev.	Learn Peers	Parent Comm.	School Safety	Student Success	Quality Work	Inst. Pract.
FP	4.33	4.61	4.67	4.61	4.82	4.55	4.61	4.79	4.48	4.67	4.58	4.67	4.74
GP	4.08	4.31	4.19	4.54	4.54	3.46	3.92	4.31	4.27	4.38	4.08	4.50	4.38
HA	4.13	4.38	4.23	4.30	4.70	3.57	4.10	4.23	4.33	4.13	4.00	4.27	4.63
HO	4.30	4.45	3.45	4.55	4.70	4.79	4.33	4.48	3.91	4.55	4.27	4.38	4.70
FO	3.91	4.05	3.45	3.64	4.00	3.14	4.05	4.14	4.00	4.45	4.00	3.82	4.68
IR	4.65	4.85	4.05	4.35	3.95	4.55	4.05	4.70	4.35	4.75	4.80	4.70	4.90
LI	4.44	4.33	3.70	3.93	4.07	4.37	4.33	4.48	4.30	4.11	3.96	4.22	4.78
LD	4.45	4.38	4.05	3.90	4.71	4.18	4.41	4.36	4.23	4.45	4.41	4.45	4.86
MA	4.23	4.40	3.67	3.80	4.62	4.27	4.21	4.47	4.14	4.34	4.33	4.27	4.63
NO	4.45	4.54	4.00	4.18	4.64	4.30	4.11	4.46	3.50	4.25	4.25	4.07	4.79
PC	4.33	4.53	4.29	4.33	4.33	4.53	4.33	4.43	4.00	4.47	4.67	4.47	4.67
PR	4.33	4.24	3.50	4.00	4.48	4.29	4.14	4.48	4.43	4.43	4.38	4.52	4.57
SJ	4.29	4.46	4.58	4.54	4.83	4.58	4.29	4.58	4.46	4.67	4.63	4.71	4.67
SH	4.26	4.13	4.57	4.48	4.74	4.52	4.09	4.26	4.22	4.70	4.36	4.39	4.83
SO	4.39	4.25	3.43	3.37	3.71	4.00	4.32	4.64	4.26	3.68	4.11	4.21	4.64
WA	3.79	3.71	4.57	4.52	4.61	3.21	3.79	3.91	3.63	4.04	3.58	3.50	4.29

Note: Averages based on 1-5 Likert-type scale where 5 = more positive and 1 = less positive.

Table 3

Demographic Data for Elementary Schools with Male Leadership

School	Aver. Faculty Age	No. of Respondents	% of Female Teachers in the Building	% of Students passing English Math ISTEP	% of students Qualified for Free or Reduced Lunch	% of student population designated as minority
FP	43	33	93	56.1%	78%	46%
GP	48	26	78	62.8%	50%	39%
HA	46	30	86	58.3%	57%	47%
HO	47	33	83	51.1%	73%	46%
FO	46	22	81	47.4%	79%	57%
IR	43	20	95	74.8%	58%	59%
LI	42	27	83	61.1%	60%	49%
LD	46	22	88	57.3%	72%	78%
MA	42	30	95	38.8%	77%	65%
NO	41	28	84	35.3%	78%	68%
PC	41	15	87	49.2%	64%	49%
PR	46	21	88	55.7%	66%	29%
SJ	50	24	93	69.5%	40%	28%
SH	46	23	88	54.0%	46%	33%
SO	45	28	82	42.3%	93%	72%
WA	46	23	89	49.3%	73%	70%

Table 4

Climate Survey Average Teacher Responses for Elementary Schools with Female Leadership

School	District Vision	School Vision	Eff. Comm.	Eff. Inst.	Prin. Resp.	Peer Resp.	Prof. Dev.	Learn Peers	Parent Comm.	School Safety	Student Success	Quality Work	Inst. Practice
AD	4.82	4.46	4.79	4.36	4.71	4.68	4.50	4.46	4.71	3.96	4.61	4.64	4.75
AR	4.70	3.78	3.91	3.65	3.96	4.43	3.87	4.00	4.13	4.17	4.43	4.26	4.26
AB	4.32	4.13	3.50	3.20	3.00	3.96	4.20	4.12	4.12	3.88	3.60	3.52	3.40
BL	4.52	3.93	3.59	3.33	3.44	4.56	3.89	4.22	4.48	3.96	3.52	3.63	3.96
BR	4.73	4.47	4.40	3.53	3.83	4.14	4.83	4.17	4.67	4.23	4.66	4.50	4.67
BU	4.86	4.07	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.50	4.14	4.36	4.64	4.43	4.86	5.00	4.93
CR	4.70	4.11	3.81	3.00	3.07	3.74	4.63	4.26	4.30	4.52	4.19	4.33	4.41
FA	4.33	3.79	4.40	4.42	4.42	4.60	4.49	4.26	4.53	3.81	4.57	4.36	4.49
HA	4.63	4.13	4.38	4.23	4.30	4.70	3.57	4.10	4.23	4.33	4.13	4.00	4.27
HH	4.50	4.28	4.06	3.61	3.61	4.33	4.25	4.09	4.44	4.19	4.28	3.94	4.36
IV	4.71	4.03	3.84	3.38	3.44	3.72	4.06	3.91	4.38	4.19	4.52	4.22	4.50
NE	4.65	4.62	4.48	3.24	3.71	4.00	3.95	4.38	4.24	3.89	4.24	4.43	4.19
SA	4.63	4.44	4.63	4.88	4.94	5.00	4.13	4.63	4.56	4.13	4.63	4.44	4.63
ST	4.58	2.79	4.13	3.76	3.83	4.20	4.08	4.33	4.40	3.92	4.52	4.38	4.40
WA	4.29	3.79	3.71	3.67	3.71	4.33	3.21	3.79	3.91	3.63	4.04	3.58	3.50
WC	4.22	3.78	3.59	2.67	2.78	2.96	4.00	3.67	4.04	4.21	4.33	3.41	3.89
WP	4.28	4.13	3.87	3.96	3.96	4.11	3.98	3.61	4.33	3.76	4.35	3.85	4.04

Table 5

Demographic Data for Elementary Schools with Female Leadership

School	Aver. Faculty Age	No. of Respondents	% of Female Teachers in the Building	% of Students passing English Math ISTEP	% of students Qualified for Free or Reduced Lunch	% of student population designated as minority
AD	36	29	90	33.3%	89%	78%
AR	45	23	91	56.3%	40%	39%
AB	42	25	91	29.7%	97%	98%
BL	40	28	86	40.5%	89%	60%
BR	47	30	83	65.5%	68%	54%
BU	34	14	87	83.3%	44%	41%
CR	42	27	74	85.0%	26%	30%
FA	37	43	84	39.6%	94%	89%
HA	42	24	86	65.1%	48%	47%
HH	42	36	87	51.2%	76%	77%
IV	42	32	86	52.0%	79%	53%
NE	45	21	96	48.1%	91%	46%
SA	34	16	87	44.9%	91%	78%
ST	37	24	90	49.3%	84%	74%