DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 237 607 UD 023 225

AUTHOR Jones, Effie H.; Montenegro, Xenia P.
TITLE Women and Minorities in School Administration: Strategies for Making a Difference. ERIC/CUE Urban Diversity Series No. 85.
INSTITUTION ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 83
CONTRACT 400-82-0012
NOTE 46p.
AVAILABLE FROM ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027 ($6.00).
PUB TYPE Reports - General (140) -- Information Analyses - ERIC Information Analysis Products (071)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Affirmative Action; Career Ladders; *Change Strategies; Elementary Secondary Education; *Employment Patterns; *Equal Opportunities (Jobs); *Females; Geographic Distribution; *Minority Groups; Principals; Racial Discrimination; *School Administration; Sex Discrimination; Superintendents

ABSTRACT

The trends which are evident in the representation of women and minorities in school administration, and the barriers which these groups face in obtaining administrative positions are the subjects of this report. Following an introductory section, section II discusses trends in the representation of women and minorities in school administration. Section III describes the geographic locations and characteristics of districts headed by female and minority superintendents, and section IV examines the career paths of female and minority superintendents. The barriers and problems faced by female, minority, and minority female administrators are considered in section V. Section VI discusses strategies for the promotion of women and minorities in school administration, and a discussion of how affirmative action programs affect minority and female representation in school administration is contained in section VII. The last section presents recommendations for the institutions and organizations which have the power to block or make available opportunities for women and minorities. (CMG)

WOMEN AND MINORITIES IN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION

STRATEGIES FOR MAKING A DIFFERENCE

Effie H. Jones

and

Xenia P. Montenegro

American Association of School Administrators

Office of Minority Affairs

ERIC/CUE Urban Diversity Series

Number 85, Fall 1983

This publication is one in the ERIC/CUE Urban Diversity Series produced by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, with funding from the National Institute of Education, United States Department of Education (contract number 400-82-0012) and Teachers College, Columbia University. The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of NIE or the Department of Education.

Copies are available from The ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027, for $6.00 each.

Copies are also available from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service, P.O. Box 190, Arlington, Virginia 22210. ERIC Document (ED) identification number and full ordering instructions will be found in Resources in Education, the monthly ERIC abstract journal, or can be obtained by contacting the Clearinghouse.

The National Institute of Education
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C. 20208

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION

In their account of Ella Flagg Young's prediction as Chicago's superintendent of schools in 1909 that women would soon predominate in school administration, Hansot and Tyack (1981) describe the golden age for women school administrators as a dream deferred. Young based her prediction on the premise that education is woman's natural field, and she would not be satisfied with doing the larger part of the work while being denied its leadership. The dream has not yet arrived, because women have continued to dominate the field of education, but have failed to claim a representative role in its administration.

Another group that has almost been invisible in school administration is the non-White American, whether he or she be Black, Asian, Hispanic, or Native American. During the early part of the nation's history, most Blacks had been denied a formal education, and thereby a part in providing and administering that education to the young. It was not until recent years that Blacks and Native Americans participated in the mainstream of our educational institutions. Hispanic and Asian Americans, on the other hand, have a relatively recent part in our nation's history.

This paper investigates the trends which are evident in the representation of women and minorities in school administration. It also examines the barriers which these groups face in obtaining admin-

istrative positions, whether they be as principals, central office administrators, or superintendents. What strategies can be utilized to overcome these barriers. Do women and minorities follow the same career paths tread by the average White male? In what regions of the country, and in what types of districts are women and minorities being appointed? Has affirmative action helped? These questions will be answered through an examination of the research.

II. TRENDS IN REPRESENTATION BY RACE AND SEX

Women In School Administration

During Young's time, no extensive surveys were conducted to determine the representation of female school administrators, but it was no secret that most school administrators were men. Some of the notable women superintendents were Richman, Echols, Young, and Dorsey (Tyack 1974). The National Education Association did conduct a survey of cities with populations of over 8,000 in 1905 (Hansot and Tyack 1981). This survey reported female representation to be 98 percent among elementary school teachers, 62 percent among elementary school principals, 64 percent among high school teachers, 6 percent among high school principals, and none among district superintendents. Young was appointed superintendent in 1909, the first woman to head a large city school system (Hansot and Tyack 1981).

Women made inroads into school administration, especially the superintendency in the 1920's. Gribskov (1980) reported that in 1928,

two thirds of the county superintendents in the midwest and western states were women. He hypothesized that the higher proportion of women in school administration at that time was linked with feminist activity. However, these superintendents were mostly in small and remote districts, with the exception of Susan Miller Dorsey of Los Angeles and Isabel Echols of Santa Fe.

In the next four decades, no statistics were reported on women superintendents, although it is generally believed that their representation declined in this period. Significant and complex events are cited in explanation: 1) in the Depression of the 1930's, married men were hired instead of women on the premise that men had to support their families; and 2) there was a decline in the activities of feminist organizations weakened by the Depression and gone complacent after their success with women's suffrage (Gribskov 1980). During both World Wars, female educators had brief opportunities to advance in school administration because of the shortage of men. After World War II, however, Gribskov cites the impact of what Betty Friedan has called the "feminine mystique": women chose to stop teaching, and many who had large families during the postwar baby boom had difficulties juggling family responsibilities and career advancement. Gribskov (1980) reported that the number of female superintendents decreased from 90 in 1960 to 84 in 1970. Thus the momentum of the women's movement halted and did not start again until a decade ago.

From 1968 onward, the National Education Association (NEA) and the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) among others,

conducted surveys and reported the distribution of administrators, specifically principals and superintendents. The results show a downward pattern from the survey of 1968, 1972, and 1974, and a rise in female representation in 1982 (National Education Association 1971, 1973, 1974; Jones and Montenegro 1982b). (See Table 1.) The percentage of female superintendents doubled from 1979 to 1982, but the increases in principals and superintendents were hardly significant, when one considers that the initial percentage was very small.

Female administrators have a long way to go before equity in school administration is obtained. The rise in their representation in recent years is encouraging, but lessons from history should not be forgotten. During hard economic times, women tend to lose out on employment (as they did during the 1930's). The weakening support by the federal government, states, and various groups for the promotion of women will affect the mobility of women in school administration, and is reminiscent of the decline of feminism during the 1930's which is believed to have also contributed to the decrease in female administrators at the time.

Minorities in School Administration

The principalship began as a head teacher's position in schools with two or more teachers. With rising student populations and the growth in building sizes, grade levels were developed, and a teacher was assigned to each grade. Principals became managers who met the planning, scheduling, coordinating, and supervisory needs of the

Table 1

Representation of Women in the Principalship and in the Superintendency

Year	% of Female Principals	% of Female Superintendents
1968	22	no data
1970	15	0.6
1974	13	0.5
1979	15	0.9
1982	16	1.8

Sources:

Hansot and Tyack 1981; Jones and Montenegro 1982b; National Education Association 1971, 1973, 1974; Smith, Mazzarella, and Piele 1981

schools. The participation of racial minorities in school administration during the early years of the nation's history actually began with Black schools requiring principals. Black principals also managed Quaker-sponsored institutions for Blacks. A forerunner of these institutions was the Institute for Colored Youth in Philadelphia, headed by Black principals from 1802 to 1903 (Haven, Adkinson and Bagley 1980).

The next wave of Black school administrators were the Jeanes supervisors. At the turn of the 20th century, Anna T. Jeanes, a Quaker, began a movement directed toward maintaining and assisting rural, community, and county schools for southern Blacks with an endowment of $1 million. The Jeanes supervisors, 80 percent of whom were Black women, concentrated their early work on bringing the school and community together and raising the general standard of living. Later, they trained teachers by assisting with curriculum development, demonstrating new teaching methods, and conducting in-service education designed to disseminate recent findings on child growth and development. Still later they focused on efficient school management and rapid dissemination of current information, and became increasingly recognized as professional leaders with professional degrees, and as members and active participants in learned societies and national professional organizations. They used their experiences to develop and disseminate supervisory strategies for Black schools and often coordinated their work with the educational leaders in colleges and universities. As the number of Black principals increased, the school

system's growing size and bureaucratization contributed to the demise of the Jeanes program (Jones and Montenegro 1982b; Haven, Adkinson and Eagley 1980).

No national surveys on the representation of Black or other minority administrators were conducted before the 1960's. There has also been no record of minorities in school administrative positions higher than principal or supervisor, i.e. superintendent, during the first half of this century. However, racial minorities, particularly Blacks, fought formidable odds to obtain formal education and to make significant contributions as authors, professors, or college presidents to the field of education.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) spurred by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, became the first agency to start collecting information on a national scale on the racial/ethnic background of school administrators. Previous to the EEOC surveys, researchers have gathered data on Blacks, but no data were reported for other racial/ethnic minority groups.

The representation of Black administrators before the EEOC surveys could not be ascertained, but researchers have reported that after the disappearance of the Jeanes supervisors and the consolidation of schools to integrate minority and non-minority students, Black principals' numbers declined. This decline took place between the 1950's and the decade of the seventies. Black principals in southern states were displaced, demoted, or given new positions with limited decision making power in "special" projects in the area or central office. For

example, Kentucky's 350 Black principals in 1954 were reduced to 36 in 1970. In Virginia, there were 107 Black secondary school principals in 1964, compared to only 10 in 1970. Other examples of declines were also reported (Coursen 1975). As the southern states lost Black principals in consolidated schools, the large urban school systems in the north showed increases in Black principals along with a growing number of Black students. Significant increases were reported in Philadelphia, Detroit, and Newark, New Jersey (Colquit 1975).

The results of EEOC surveys (EEOC 1974, 1977 1979, 1981), as well as those obtained by the American Association of School Administrators (Jones and Montenegro 1982b) show that there was very little change in the representation of racial/ethnic minorities in the principalship. According to the 1980 Census (Bureau of the Census 1980), approximately 23 percent of the present population in our country belong to racial/ethnic minority groups. In school principal positions across the country, their representation was 9 percent in 1974, and increased to approximately 12 percent in 1982 (Jones and Montenegro 1982b).

The first Black superintendents were believed to have been appointed in Black communities in the South. The first Black superintendents who were reported by name (one man and one woman) were appointed in 1956. The National Alliance of Black School Educators (Scott 1980) identified four Blacks as early superintendents: Lillard Ashley of Boley, Oklahoma (1956), Lorenzo R. Smith of Hopkins Park, Illinois (1956), E.W. Warrior of Taft, Oklahoma (1958), and Arthur Shropshire of Kinloch, Missouri (1963).

Table 2

Representation of Minorities in the Principalship

Year	% of Minority Principals
1974	9
1975	10
1978	11
1979	11
1982	12

Source: Jones and Montenegro 1982b

A study conducted in 1961 yielded five Black superintendents in charge of rural, Black districts in Arkansas. These districts had approximately 350 students each, the state minimum. Although the chief administrator was called "superintendent," he was more of a supervising principal (Scott 1980). During that period, the only other Black superintendent outside of the South was in Lincoln Heights, Ohio, where 98 percent of the 8,000 students were Black (Jones and Montenegro 1982b).

In 1969, the Rockefeller Foundation identified only 17 Black superintendents nationwide. Not one among them was in a city school district despite the large concentration of Blacks in these districts (Scott 1980). Charles Moody (1971) identified 21 school systems headed by Black superintendents in 1970, and in 1974, 44 Black superintendents were reported (Scott 1980).

Before the AASA survey by Jones and Montenegro (1982b), there have been no national surveys of the representation of various racial/ethnic minority groups in the superintendency. Trend data can only be reported for Black superintendents, from the reported five in 1961, to 17 in 1969, 21 in 1970, 44 in 1974, and 96 in 1982. The present number of Black superintendents is less than one percent for the more than 16,000 school systems in the country. AASA's survey also yielded an estimate of 108 Hispanic superintendents in 1982 (most of them in the states of California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas) and five Asian superintendents.

Several trends were noted by researchers (Colquit 1975; Coursen 1975; Moody 1971) which influence the recruitment and selection of Black school administrators, and perhaps other racial minority administrators.

1. The larger the minority student population of a school system, the more minority administrators are appointed. It has been observed that Chicago, Atlanta, New York, Washington, D.C., and Baltimore, large cities with predominantly Black school populations, have greater numbers of Black administrators. There are also more Hispanic administrators, including superintendents, in predominantly Hispanic communities in California, Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona. Four of the five current Asian American superintendents are in the heavily Asian-populated state of California.

2. The tenure of Black school administrators, especially Black superintendents, tends to be of short duration because they are usually in urban districts with the most severe problems. This hypothesis does not apply to non-Black minority superintendents, because they tend to administer districts which are not as large, and which may have fewer problems associated with large urban districts.

3. Despite the underrepresentation of minorities in school administration, a large percentage of superintendents still do not actively engage in efforts to recruit minorities.

III. GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS AND CHARACTERISTICS OF DISTRICTS HEADED BY WOMEN AND MINORITIES

Female Superintendents

The AASA survey (Jones and Montenegro 1982b) revealed that the majority of the states in the Northeast had a higher percentage of female superintendents (3 percent or more) than the national average of 1.8 percent. Among the north and central states, North Dakota led in the appointment of female superintendents (11 percent). However, all other states in the region reported a female representation of 1 percent or less. In the South, 5 of the 17 states reported no female superintendents, and 5 states had fewer female superintendents than the national average. Another 6 states had more female superintendents than the national average, including Washington, D.C., whose only school district is headed by a woman. In the West, 10 of the 13 states had at least higher than average female representation in the superintendency, including Hawaii, where the statewide system is presently headed by a woman. Two states in the West, however, had no female superintendents.

Although it can be concluded that higher percentages of female superintendents were generally found in the states of the Northeast and in the West, no clearly defined differences were found between

regions. Surveys have also been conducted by the Project on Equal Education Rights (1979 and 1982) and by the National Center for Education Statistics (1977) of the female representation of school administrators on a state-by-state basis. Washington D.C. ranked among the first five jurisdictions across all surveys with the highest percentage of female school administrators. Florida and Hawaii ranked among the top ten states in all surveys (Jones 1982).

Responses from 133 women on the superintendency surveyed by AASA (Jones and Montenegro 1982b) indicated that although the majority of the women headed small school districts, a few Black women headed the large school districts of Chicago, Hawaii, Philadelphia, and Washington, D.C. A smaller percentage of women than men headed unified school districts; while only 30 percent of the nation's schools are in urban and surburban communities, 40 percent of the districts headed by women were in these areas. In fact, 32 percent of women superintendents were in suburban communities. Thus, although women are generally believed to head small rural districts, this seems for the most part due to the fact that most districts in the country are small and rural in the first place. Perhaps a more accurate description might be that women tend to head small, unified districts in suburbia.

Minority Superintendents

The National Center for Education Statistics (Dearman and Plisko 1981) reported that in the fall of 1978, the minority student enrollment in public elementary and secondary schools was 25 percent. This figure is expected to grow due to the higher birth rates among racial

minorities. Minority teachers, however, comprised only 8.5 percent of the total in 1982 (National Education Association Research 1982). Recent estimates of minority school administrators are 13 percent of the total; minority superintendents are estimated at 2 percent; deputy/associate/assistant superintendents at 11 percent and principals at 12 percent (Jones and Montenegro 1982b).

It is difficult to determine minority representation in school administration on a regional or state level because a large number of states do not collect data on the race and ethnicity of its school administrators. In the AASA-AWARE survey (Jones 1982), only 26 states reported (with complete data or based on a sample) a breakdown of school administrators by race. Twenty-nine states had a racial breakdown for superintendents and principals.

Among the states that reported data to AASA, those states with higher minority populations generally had higher percentages of minority school administrators. This is not surprising, since minority superintendents were appointed in school districts with large minority populations. Hawaii, the state with the largest minority population (67 percent) is currently headed by a Black superintendent. Eighty-nine percent of Hawaii's principals in 1982 were from racial/ethnic minority (primarily Asian) backgrounds (Jones and Montenegro 1982b). In Washington D.C., the proportions of Black principals on board in 1982 was 96 percent; this figure surpassed the percentage of this city's minority population (73 percent). However, its only superintendent is a Black female.

Relatively higher percentages of racial/ethnic minority principals were also reported in southern states with large Black populations as well as in western states with large Hispanic and Asian populations. However, it was not uncommon for states in the South (there were at least five) with large Black populations and relatively higher percentages of Black principals, to have only a 1 percent or less minority representation among its superintendents. At least 4 other states where minority population comprised more than 20 percent of the population did not collect any data (Jones 1982).

Minority superintendents tended to head urban school districts. While 30 percent of the nation's superintendents head school districts which are in urban and suburban communities, 60 percent of the minority superintendents in 1982 headed districts in these communities (Jones and Montenegro 1982a). Many of these large communities with large minority populations have serious problems. This has led Scott (1980) to ask: Are Black superintendents appointed as messiahs who will produce miracles and solve such severe district problems as lack of finances, personnel and student revolt, and poor academic achievement, or are they scapegoats whose jobs are yanked away from them when they don't "perform"?

IV. PATTERNS FOR ENTERING AND ADVANCING IN THE PROFESSION

Various theories have been advanced about how careers are developed, and various research studies have been conducted on career

paths followed by women and minorities in school administration. It has been hypothesized that childhood experiences influence career paths in adult life. Boys and girls are conditioned to think about jobs and occupations as sex-specific; boys are encouraged to be more independent, to achieve more, and to dominate. In the schools, career paths are influenced by sex-stereotyping that can be seen in teacher attitudes, sports programs, course offerings, vocational counseling, and curriculum materials. Young students identify with role models presented for various occupations. These early models affect future careers (MacDonald 1979; Tibbetts 1979; Stockard 1980) and conditioning continues in postsecondary school. There are few female and minority professors, and women and minorities may be denied the career guidance and opportunities provided to their majority-male counterparts.

Criswell (1975) has pointed out how the attainment of the superintendency depends upon a specific career pattern. The upward mobility process is complex and highly selective and dependent upon preliminary positions and the length of time they are held. Nonobservance of the process results in the exclusion of certain groups such as minorities and women. Patterns may filter employees by race and sex as hierarchical level increases (Adkison, 1981).

Ortiz (1975), also emphasized that it is especially crucial for minorities to study career patterns toward the superintendency and follow these career patterns.

> If the career pattern leading to the superintendency includes certain positions, it behooves members of a minority group to be cognizant of those positions....

> It is necessary to consider those factors which may be acting upon school men which have led to the development of specific career patterns and their importance to the functioning aspects of each of the positions held (p. 10).

Career Paths of Female Superintendents

Perhaps the two most common career paths toward school superintendent are: teacher--principal--central office administrator--superintendent (usual in large districts) or teacher--principal--superintendent (usual in small districts). The vice-principal position is also considered important, because it serves as an important proving ground and is the first step toward the superintendency (Reed 1975).

A number of observations have been made in comparison of men's and women's career paths toward the superintendency. McDade (1981) found the most common career path for women to be teacher, assistant principal, principal, central office administrator, and superintendent. More female superintendents traveled the traditional career route from teacher to principal to central office position to superintendent, whereas men often skipped steps. Delays were noted in women's careers because of family interruptions but were largely due to having to gain more experience, education, and maturity in age in comparison with men (Pitner and Ogawa 1981; Richardson 1979; Keim 1978.)

Douglas and Simonson (1982) noted that men take less time than women to become superintendents after the initial teaching experience. Among the male and female superintendents in their sample, 54 percent of the men (but not one woman) were appointed superintendents within a 10-year period following their initial appointment as teachers.

Career Patterns of Minority Superintendents

There is a dearth of research on the career patterns of minority administrators, particularly superintendents. Research which has so far been reported includes the results of a survey by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (Hines and Byrne 1979). In general Black principals were found to be academically well-prepared and experienced, and were appointed to their positions at an older age and with more years of teaching experience than their White counterparts.

Payne and Jackson's research (1978) showed that Black female administrators followed an employment pattern of teacher, director of special projects, assistant principal, principal, and superintendent. Mexican-American (female) administrators, on the other hand, were found to be younger than Black or White female administrators holding the same position, although they had similar teaching and educational qualifications (Ortiz and Venegas 1978).

Contreras (1979) reported that Spanish-surnamed administrators appeared to be younger and better educated, but spent more time as classroom teachers and less time in lower administrative ranks. No research has been reported on Asian female superintendents' career paths.

V. BARRIERS AND PROBLEMS FACED BY FEMALE AND MINORITY ADMINISTRATORS

Unquestionably, many more women and minorities have aspired for and tried to climb the ladder of school administration than those who

have succeeded. Needless to say, their ability to administer school districts should not be determined by their sex or race. Studies have been conducted which compared the administrative performance and leadership behavior of men and women. On the whole, these studies were not conclusive because of methodological problems with what constitute effective administrative performance and leadership behavior, and other variables which are difficult to control (Adkison 1981; Mark 1980). There is no evidence at all that White males are better school administrators. In fact, the tentative results that are available show women in a favorable light. However, women and minorities face many barriers in their efforts to move up on the ladder of school administration. These barriers affect women and minorities in different ways and in different degrees, but they can also be more or less prohibitive at certain career levels.

Barriers Against Women

The barriers against women in administrative careers can be analyzed from different persepectives. Lyman and Speizer (1980) have categorized barriers into three models: the women's place model, wherein women and men are socialized in different ways; the discriminatory model, where institutional patterns in the hiring and training of administrators encourage the promotion of men rather than women; and the meritocracy model, where men are assumed to be more competent administrators.

Estler (1975) proposed that the absence of women in leadership positions is due to the different ways men and women are socialized.

Women are reared to defer to men and to be nurturing rather than aggressive. Old attitudes, prejudices, and child-rearing patterns have conditioned men to assume leadership positions while women provide support. Society's values and beliefs in turn affect men's and women's behaviors and the institutions what provide or limit career opportunities.

A more common and perhaps useful framework with which to analyze career constraints for women is to classify them into internal and external barriers. Internal barriers stem from the personal conflicts experienced by women and the personal qualities often associated with women. Many times the role of wife-mother is perceived as incompatible with the role of career woman; this leads to personal anxiety, personal sanctions, and the rejection of one role (usually the career, achievement-oriented role) and acceptance of the other (usually the mother-wife role). Role conflicts tend to prevent women from being geographically mobile and deny them family support for their careers. Feelings of guilt or inadequacy in one or both roles are not uncommon. Lack of aggressiveness, low-aspirations, low self-image, lack of self-confidence, and lack of social skills in relating to others result. Women find themselves hesitant and reluctant to take risks (Hennig and Jardim 1977).

External barriers obstructing women's career advancement are reflected in social attitudes and institutional systems and structures. The external barriers no doubt interact with and reinforce the internal barriers. Thus women's so-called lack of aspiration

may be more of a response to lack of opportunity brought about by external barriers (Shakeshaft 1983). One of the external barriers facing women in school administration is the lack of support, encouragement or counseling from family, peers, or superiors. Family and home responsibilities, the lack of reliable childcare, and limited pregnancy benefits were also reported as obstacles for women to overcome. Lack of finances for training, too few role models, lack of sponsorship or mentors, lack of a network, and sex discrimination in hiring and promotion are specific and real institutional barriers to women (Jones and Montenegro 1982b).

Barriers Against Minorities

Not much research has been reported in the literature regarding barriers against minorities in school administration; nevertheless, barriers exist and can even be more overwhelming than the barriers faced by women. AASA's study of women and minorities in school administration found that whatever ground was lost by White males in school administration was gained mostly by White women. Gains by racial minorities in obtaining school administrative positions were minimal during the last ten years (Jones and Montenegro 1982b).

A major factor in the general exclusion of minorities in school administration was what Valverde (1980) has termed "succession socialization." Minorities and women are excluded from promotions because of their deviation from White, male behavioral norms; selection is based on cultural similarity rather than competence. Faulty characteristics

are consciously or unconsciously attributed to minorities and women with the unsubstantiated assumption that said qualities will prevent functioning in an administrative role (Valverde 1980, p.8). Culturally different persons are filtered out, and, ultimately, the minorities who do succeed in being part of the "good ole boy" network are those who have been acculturated. Valverde notes that minorities historically have resisted acculturation (particularly Mexican Americans), and since socializing is a form of acculturation, sponsorship is not sought. Lovelady-Dawson (1980) further notes that minorities' traditionally limited participation in educational administration has denied most of them the chance to learn the dynamics of the system and a way to become involved in them. Many minorities may even be unaware of the barriers that they face in their ascent in the administrative hierarchy.

Subtle discriminatory methods have also been reported in addition to the unspoken brotherhood of White males. Timpano and Knight (1976) cite that these "filtering methods" include recruiting filters, application filters, selection-criteria filters, interview filters, and selection-decision filters.

Barriers Against Minority Women

Minority women are doubly handicapped in their aspiration to leadership roles. They face barriers common to their sex as well as to their race, and many times they cannot determine which "ism" they are up against--this is their double bind, described by minority female scientists Malcolm, Hall, and Brown (1976). Female school administrators are often pulled by two sides--by women's and

minorities' groups and organizations. If a woman affiliates herself with both, tremendous demands are placed on her time, and neither side treats her as a whole person with some of the same problems as her female or minority male counterparts as well as some different ones.

Doughty (1977) notes that Black women with positions in school administration should be especially careful not to become victims of institutional manipulation. A Black woman may be pitted against a Black male administrator, denied a decision-making role in the central office system, or isolated so that she has little or no communication with others. Black women have to seek support from significant others and at the same time develop confidence in their own abilities.

VI. STRATEGIES IN THE PROMOTION OF WOMEN AND MINORITIES IN SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION

Different strategies have been used in the promotion of women and minorities in school administration. These strategies can perhaps be best categorized by using Hansot and Tyack's (1981) perspectives on how barriers facing women and minorities should be analyzed. They believe that real and lasting change require persistent efforts at three closely interconnected levels--the individual level, the organizational level, and the broader society.

Focus on helping the individual is the most common strategy and has been implemented through training workshops, courses, and programs to teach women and minorities the socialization skills and approaches to promote themselves in their careers. Illustrative examples of such

training include the Women in School Administration (WISA) project, which offered workshops on conflict management, the study of power and leadership, time management, grant writing, and other topics; A Project of Internships, Certification, Equity, Leadership, and Support (ICES), which awarded scholarships to women to attend summer sessions and workshops; Female Leaders for Administration and Management in Education (FLAME), which allows its interns to receive monthly stipends while taking leaves of absence to pursue full-time graduate work; and Sex Equity in Education Leadership (SEEL), where personnel give talks to education groups to reach out to prospective women administrators (Shakeshaft 1983). The Women's Educational Equity Act (WEEA) Program has also funded workshops for women, and a project to develop a model for enhancing women's entry into school administration. The Career Women in Education program, designed by Timpano and Knight, aims to increase the number of women administrators on Long Island, New York (Haven, Adkinson, and Bagley 1980). With funding from the Ford Foundation, the AASA's Project AWARE (Assisting Women to Advance through Resources and Encouragement) trains female administrators to develop a more positive self-concept, form networks, enlist the assistance of a sponsor, present an effective resume, improve interviewing techniques, and negotiate employment compensation. Together with its five regional centers, Project AWARE also provides information, support services, and a network to women school administrators.

Training opportunities for minorities include the Rockefeller and F Foundation training programs, designed to help trainees

toward superintendencies and other responsible positions in school administration. Educational Training for a Multi-Cultural Community, a program at the University of New Mexico, trains educational administrators to become agents of educational change and to become aware of their impact on other human beings. Other programs, such as the Educational Administrator Training Program for Native Americans, and the Navajo Administrator Training Cooperative Education Program at the University of Colorado, train minorities for positions in school administration (Haven, Adkinson, and Bagley,1980).

Various degrees of success have been attributed to these training programs. However, it is not enough to train individuals. A simultaneous change is needed in institutions which have the power to open opportunities to these individuals. Legal and political considerations have positively influenced school districts to employ more minorities and women. School districts which have developed affirmative action programs have taken the first critical step toward change.

Sex equity and desegregation centers as well as associations like AASA have disseminated information, provided assistance in locating women and minority candidates, and helped develop affirmative action plans to correct discriminatory hiring procedures. Institutional efforts to promote women and minorities were outlined by Coursen (1975), Valverde (1980), and Bornstein (1982), and include:

-- identification of women and minorities who are qualified or qualifiable and interested in administration

-- identification and elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment

-- development of nondiscriminatory criteria

-- identification and elimination of potentially culturally and sex-biased factors in employment so as to eliminate their exclusionary components

-- wide publicity for available administrative positions

-- active recruitment of women and minorities with good potential for specific job openings

-- training and internship experiences as appropriate

-- nondiscriminatory interview procedures

-- objective selection procedures

-- administrative support for newly selected female and minority administrators

-- provision of relevant information to new female and minority administrators

-- standardized evaluation criteria for procedures for all administrators

-- development of an affirmative action plan with clear goals and timetables for increasing female and minority participation in administration

-- an effective monitoring process for the plan.

A further institutional strategy adopted by AASA's Project AWARE is the provision of collegial support to women superintendents. A female superintendent often feels isolated and alone in a hostile environment when there are forces in the community that are not yet receptive to women in the superintendency. Organizational strategies used by the University Council for Educational Administration and WISA also include the development and dissemination of how-to materials, such as a hiring procedures manual for school boards. The Project on Equal Education Rights (PEER) of the NOW Legal

Defense and Education Fund has developed a package of materials. Workshops and presentations have also been given to audiences who have impact on hiring. The Center for Sex Equity in Schools at the University of Michigan's School of Education (Ann Arbor) publishes a newsletter featuring articles on female minority educators. The Center has developed a checklist on sex equity in school administration and recommends its use by school districts.

Lastly, change in the broader society is collectively the responsibility of the individuals in the society, the government, and all of society's institutions. The Civil Rights Act has made some progress in eliminating discrimination. The proposed Equal Rights Amendment and the laws and regulations passed by various states promise to contribute to the collective effort. The work of feminist and minority organizations, leadership by an informed federal bureaucracy, the education of the new generation, and the collective efforts of individuals have vast potential for attitudinal change, the final factor in societal reform.

VII. AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Various laws have been passed by the federal government to prevent discrimination against women and racial minorities and to provide equal employment opportunities regardless of sex or race. Legislation most directly related to the appointment of school administrators is Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which

prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, or sex. Title IX of the Education Amendment Act of 1972 prohibits sex discrimination among recipients of federal education grants, and the Vocational Education Act of 1976 requires the appointment of sex equity coordinators to assist the states in implementing equal employment opportunity legislation. Executive Order 11246 prohibits employment discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, or sex in institutions or agencies with federal contracts of over $10,000.

Local and state governments have responded with varying degrees of affirmative action to promote women and minorities in school administration. The National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs (1981) reports that the influence of Title IX has led many states to make special efforts to increase the number of women hired for administrative jobs. For example, the New York State Education Department cooperates with the Statewide Advisory Council on Equal Opportunity for Women in sponsoring a Job Network Information Service to help local school districts recruit and promote women. This service provides information on job vacancies to a network of women and to school officials, monitors administrative hirings, and identifies qualified women for a candidate pool which is distributed widely throughout the state.

Local and state efforts for promoting women have actually been documented in a report by Bailey and Smith of the Council of Chief State School Officers (1982). They note that "many states have

taken action in recent years to preserve and enhance the progress made in eliminating sex discrimination in education employment" (Bailey and Smith 1982, p. 83) through affirmative action programs and legislation. Two states, Illinois and New York, have instituted programs to develop a network of women interested in positions in educational administration. Michigan, on the other hand, has developed the Multi-Phased Model for Compliance and Sex Equity in order to assist local education agencies. Their On-Site Planning model provides consulting services upon request to school districts that are committed to increasing the number of women educational administrators and effecting systematic changes at the district level.

State constitutional provisions in the form of Equal Rights Amendments for women were enacted in 14 states: Alaska, Connecticut, Colorado, Hawaii, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, and Wyoming. Seven of these states extended the amendments to include race. Moreover, 38 states and the District of Columbia have enacted Fair Employment Practices (FEP) laws which prohibit discrimination in employment on the basis of race, color, creed, national origin, and sex; 36 states have enacted separate Equal Pay acts which forbid sex-based differentials in pay; and 5 states include equal pay protection in their Fair Employment Practices laws. On the basis of Bailey and Smith's survey (1982) it seems that affirmative action laws and regulations are present in at least one form or another in all states, although the comprehensiveness of such legal provisions vary from state to state. For such laws

or regulations to be useful, however, the question of compliance has to be faced.

Vergon (1983) reports that "to date, there has been surprisingly little litigation alleging a pattern or practice of gender-based discrimination in selecting administrators for our nation's schools" (p.128), in contrast to the substantial volume of litigation aimed at opening managerial positions to women in the private sectors. A few suits regarding the impact of administrative selection procedures of women, which were not in compliance with Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, have been brought against school districts. Two of the suits were resolved by a negotiated settlement, yielded little in terms of legal precedent, and resulted in no findings of unlawful discrimination. However, the agreements included the implementation of court sanctioned affirmative action plans.

The guidelines of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) regarding the adoption of voluntary affirmative action programs were issued to assure that school districts are in compliance with the law. However, there is little information available to gauge whether school districts do, in fact, follow EEOC standards. Sandler (1982) explored the extent of EEOC compliance in one aspect of the hiring process, the employment application form, in 71 percent of the school districts throughout one state. Upon review of the EEOC forms, it was ascertained that two-thirds of the school districts used application forms which reflected little or no awareness of federal equal employment opportunity guidelines; this finding was based on the

number of suspect questions (involving race, sex, age, national origin, etc.) on the forms. Most of the districts in the sample had small populations (10,000 persons), and this may be a factor in the results, since smaller districts may not be aware of EEOC guidelines and have fewer resources for setting up affirmative action programs. Another surprising finding was that districts with large minority populations were more likely to include a question about race on their application form. Sandler (1982) was astonished to find superintendents, at least in the state surveyed, were ignorant of the law, and states that "a more plausible assumption is that ignorance of the law represents a deliberate failure to become informed about and adopt the philosophy of equal employment opportunity" (p.422). In fact, Miller and Associates (1978) had reported earlier that the key variable in a district's compliance with the regulations was the prevailing attitude expressed by the district. Results of Miller and Associates' survey (1978) to evaluate the effects of Title IX on hiring practices in one state also indicated that voluntary compliance had been minimal, that sex based attitudes persisted in staff and faculty, and that no efforts were made to promote Title IX nor to seriously determine whether programs were discriminatory.

A Rand Corporation study on Title IX conducted for the U.S. Office of Education shows that implementation of Title IX is handled as an administrative procedure by mid-level district employees and with no involvement by the school board (Hill and Rettig 1980). Various other studies reviewed by Bornstein (1981) found that compliance was

generally on paper only and was superficial; that whenever a Title IX coordinator was appointed, that person held multiple responsibilities, spent little time on Title IX matters, and was torn between conflicting roles of advocate, compliance officer, and institutional defender; and that self-evaluation reports generally did not provide for remediation and modification. If there were avenues for grievances, they were usually not well publicized. Thus, grievance procedures were seldom used. Extended periods were used to resolve grievances which placed great burdens on the people involved.

If compliance with Title IX has been found lacking, the extent of compliance with other laws and regulations, including those to prevent discrimination against racial minorities and those passed by state governments, is not known because of a lack of evaluation studies. It is suspected that compliance occurs less at the district level and is influenced by the rigor with which the state departments of education implement their statewide affirmative-action programs.

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

We have outlined the deficiencies in the representation and selection of minorities and women in school administration, but what needs to be done about the problem? Many recommendations have been advanced in the literature on the promotion of women and minorities in school administration. It is not uncommon to have the recommendations directed to the aspiring women and minorities themselves. Perhaps it

is best to change course here and direct our recommendations toward greater societal forces: the institutions and organizations which have the power to block or unblock opportunities for women and minorities.

(1) Research, data collection, and dissemination of information on the status of women and minorities in school administration should be vigorously pursued in order to keep the problem visible for as long as it exists. Districtwide school systems and state departments of education, as a first step in demonstrating their commitment to equal opportunity, should maintain records and statistics of the representation of women and minorities in their school systems. The AASA survey (Jones and Montenegro 1982b) revealed that only half of the states kept and made available information on the sex and race or ethnicity of its school administrators. The rest of the states did not keep any records at all of the race of their school administrators in various levels. Claims made by states that they are equal opportunity employers should be supported by statistical data showing timelines for increasing female and minority representation as well as data showing increases in their employment at all levels of the career ladder. Position levels and definitions should be standardized so that statistical aggregates could be collected at the national level. The best way for doing this would to be follow the position categories described and used by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in its periodic surveys of samples of school districts nationwide. National organizations should collect and publish nationwide data in order to raise consciousness and maintain awareness of the problem at the national level.

(2) School board members and officials in all districts should become aware of the law and make a conscious effort to comply with or to implement affirmative action policies and programs already in place. Hiring and promotion procedures should be reviewed and evaluated to determine whether they are indeed free from bias. Assistance with these measures may be obtained from any desegregation assistance center. For example, the University of Michigan's Center for Sex Equity in schools has published a checklist to help school systems evaluate their hiring practices.

State departments of education should work more closely with school districts to provide inservice, especially to small districts in rural areas, in ensuring compliance with the law and in developing nondiscriminatory hiring and promotion procedures. They should also be made aware of nondiscriminatory rules for demoting or firing employees, especially during times when they are faced with dwindling finances and employee cutbacks.

Monitoring procedures for affirmative action programs should be developed and strictly implemented, as they will go a long way in determining whether the district is in fact consciously working to provide career employment opportunities to women and minorities, or consciously or unconsciously barring them from entry.

(3) School systems should adopt an active recruiting policy with regard to female and minority administrators that finds and tries new methods. Two ways of reaching more women and minorities, for example,

is to advertise positions in female and minority sponsored publications and to send notices of job openings to women's and minorities' organizations. Because women and minorities have generally been barred from holding certain higher level positions (i.e. the superintendency), these positions should not be used as criteria for hiring, since they would automatically disqualify them and perpetuate their nonentry. Hiring committees, in evaluating the qualifications of women and minorities, should give the same credit to their experiences as they would the experience of White males.

(4) Greater resources should be made available for educating the public about the law and their rights with regard to employment by using various means, such as a general media campaign, or direct contact with organizational personnel who can make changes in hiring and promotion. National organizations and feminist and minority groups could work together in this effort. They should consolidate resources to protect hard won gains in equal employment opportunity, especially at a time when the federal government moves into retrenchment. Progressive organizations must fill the void left by the government and, at the same time, put pressure on government to pick up where it left off in protecting civil rights and equal opportunity.

(5) Graduate schools of educational administration should evaluate their programs to determine how they meet the needs of women and racial minorities in their curriculum and in their departmental recruitment, hiring, and promotion of students and staff. They must actively recruit

women and minorities and provide the support these groups need before and after they leave school. Networks should be started and opportunities made available during this period. In addition, professors in graduate school programs should become sensitized to the problem and demonstrate their commitment by including women and minorities in their ranks.

REFERENCES

Adkison, J.A.
1981 "Women In School Administration: A Review of the Research." Review of Educational Research 51, 3: 311-343.

Bailey, S.B. and Smith, R., eds.
1982 Policies for the Future: State Policies, Regulations, and Resources Related to the Achievement of Educational Equity for Females and Males. Washington, D.C.: Resource Center on Sex Equity, Council of Chief State School Officers.

Bornstein, R.
1981 Title IX Compliance and Sex Equity: Definitions, Distinctions, Costs, and Benefits. Urban Diversity Series, Number 73. New York, NY: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Teachers College, Columbia University. ED 202 948.

Bureau of the Census
1980 Statistical Abstract of the United States 1980. 101st edition. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce.

Colquit, J.L.
1975 "The Increase of Black Administrators in Metropolitan School Systems." NASSP Bulletin 59, 410: 70-74. Arlington, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Contreras, A.R.
1979 "Spanish-Surnamed Administrators." Emergent Leadership, 3, 2: 33-47.

Coursen, D.
1975 Women and Minorities in Administration. Research Analysis Series, Number 3, and NAESP School Leadership Digest, Series 11. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, and Reston, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals. ED 102 640.

Criswell, L.W., ed.
1975 Socialization and Training into the School Administrative Role. Papers presented at the Annual Meeting of the California Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA, November 13-14. ED 147 961.

Dearman, N.B., and Plisko, V.W.
1981 The Condition of Education: 1981 Edition. Statistical Report. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics. ED 207 186.

Doughty, R.N.
1977 Training and Hiring of Educational Administrators: Considerations for the Black Women. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, NY, April 4-8.

Douglas, L.D. and Simonson, S.U.
1982 A Comparison of Life Experiences and Leader Behaviors Between Male and Female Superintendents. Doctoral dissertation, Seattle University, Seattle, WA.

Estler, S.
1975 "Women as Leaders in Public Education." Signs 1, 2: 363-387.

Gribskov, M.
1980 "Feminism and the Woman School Administrator." In Women and Educational Leadership, edited by S. Biklen and M. Brannigan, pp.77-91. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Company.

Hansot, E. and Tyack, D.
1981 The Dream Deferred: A Golden Age for Women School Administrators. Stanford, CA: Institute for Research on Educational Finance and Governance, School of Education, Stanford University. ED 207 161.

Haven, E.W., Adkinson, P.D., and Bagley, M.
1980 Minorities in Educational Administration: The Principalship. A Literature Review. Annandale, VA: JWK International Corporation. ED 208 485.

Hennig, M. and Jardim, A.
1977 The Managerial Woman. New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday.

Hill, P.T. and Rettig, R.
1980 Mechanisms for the Implementation of Civil Rights Guarantees by Educational Institutions. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation. ED 190 719.

Hines, S.A. and Byrne, D.R.
1979 In Portrait, Black Principals: NASSP Study Provides Meaningful Data. Arlington, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Jones, E.H.
1982 A State by State Look at Women and Minorities in School Administration. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Jones, E.H. and Montenegro, X.P.
1982a Profiles of School Districts Headed by Women and Racial/Ethnic Minority Superintendents. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Jones, E.H. and Montenegro, X.P.
1982b Recent Trends in the Representation of Women and Minorities in School Administration and Problems in Documentation. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Keim, A.S.
1978 Women and the Superintendency: A Comparison of Male and Female Career Paths and Expectations. Doctoral Dissertation, Lehigh University, Bethlehem, PA.

Lovelady-Dawson, F.
1980 "Women and Minorities in the Principalship: Career Opportunities and Problems." NAASP Bulletin 64, 440: 18-28. Arlington, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Lyman, K.D. and Spiezer, J.J.
1980 "Advancing in School Administration: A Pilot Project for Women." Harvard Educational Review 50, 1: 25-35.

MacDonald, J.K.
1979 "Upward Mobility for Women in Elementary Education." In Women in Higher Education: A Book of Readings, edited by M.C. Berry, pp.37-41, Washington, D.C.: The National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors.

Malcolm, S.M., Hall, P.Q., and Brown, J.W.
1976 The Double Bind: The Price of Being a Minority Woman in Science. Report on a Conference of Minority Women. Washington, D.C.: American Association for the Advancement of Science. ED 130 851.

Mark, S.F.
1980 Leadership in Higher Education: A Critical Review of Sex Differences. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA, April.

McDade, T.
1981 Career Path Models for Women Superintendents. Doctoral Dissertation, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ.

Miller and Associates, Inc., Olympia, WA.
1978 The Status of Title IX in Region X. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. ED 177 250.

Moody, C.D.
1971 Black Superintendents in Public School Districts: Trends and Conditions. Doctoral Dissertation, Northwestern University, Evanston, IL. Dissertation Abstracts International, 32, 2965A.

National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs
1981 Title IX: The Half-Full, Half Empty Glass. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

National Center for Education Statistics
1977 "Number of Administrative Staff Employed by Public School Systems, by Type of Assignment, Sex, State, and Outlying Area. Statistics of Public Elementary and Secondary Schools. Washington, D.C.: NCES.

National Education Association
1971 "Professional Women in Public Schools, 1970-71." NEA Research Bulletin (October): 67-68. Washington, D.C.: NEA.

National Education Association
1973 Research Division Research Report 1973-R5, 26th Biennial Salary and Staff Survey of Public School Professional Personnel, 1972-73. Washington, D.C.: NEA.

National Education Association
1974 Research Division Research Report 1973-R8, Estimates of School Statistics, 1973-74. Washington, D.C.: NEA.

National Education Association
1982 Status of the American Public School Teacher, 1980-81. Washington, D.C.: NEA.

Ortiz, F.I.
1975 "Socialization into Administrative Roles and Its Effects on Minority Groups." In Socialization and Training Into the School Administrative Role, edited by L.W. Criswell, pp. 9-12. Papers presented at the Annual Meeting of the California Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA, November 13-14. ED 147 961.

Ortiz, F.I. and Venegas, Y.
1978 "Chicana (female) School Administrators." Emergent Leadership 2, 2: 55-60.

Payne, N.J. and Jackson, B.L.
1978 "Status of Black Women in Educational Administration." Emergent Leadership, 2, 3: 4.

Pitner, N.J. and Ogawa, R.T.
1981 "Organizational Leadership: The Case of The School Superintendent." Educational Administration Quarterly 17 :45-65.

Project on Equal Education Rights
1979 In America's Schools Its Still a Man's World. Washington, D.C.: PEER.

Project on Equal Education Rights
1982 A Statement by Holly Knox. Washington, D.C.: PEER.

Reed, B.D.
1975 "The Socialization of the Secondary Vice-Principal." In Socialization and Training into the School Administrative Role, edited by L.W. Criswell, pp.4-8. Papers presented at the Annual Meeting of the California Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA, November 13-14. ED 147 961.

Richardson, J.A.
1979 Woman Superintendents of Public Schools in the United States: Factors Contributing to Obtaining the Position. Doctoral Dissertation, Drake University, Des Moines, IA.

Sandler, M.
1982 "Equal Employment Opportunity Consciousness among Arkansas Public School Districts. Journal of Negro Education, 51, 4: 412-424.

Scott, H.J.
1980 The Black School Superintendent: Messiah or Scapegoat? Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press.

Shakeshaft, C.
1983 "Strategies for Overcoming the Barriers to Women in Educational Administration." In Achieving Sex Equity Through Education. Book in preparation.

Smith, S.C., Mazzarella, J.A., and Piele, P.K., eds.
1981 School Leadership: Handbook for Survival. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. ED 209 736.

Stockard, J.
1980 Sex Equity in Educational Leadership: An Analysis of a Planned Social Change Project. Newton, MA: Educational Development Center.

Tibbetts, S.L.
1979 "Why don't Women Aspire to Leadership Positions in Education?" In Women in Higher Education: A Book of Readings, edited by M.C. Berry, pp. 1-11. Washington D.C.: The National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors.

Timpano, D.M. and Knight, L.W.
1976 Sex Discrimination in the Selection of School District Administrators: What Can Be Done? NIE Papers in Education and Work, Number Three. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Tyack, D.B.
1974 The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.

United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
1974 Elementary-Secondary Staff Information (EEO-5). Washington D.C.: EEOC.

United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
1977 Equal Employment Opportunity in the Schools: Job Patterns of Minorities and Women in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, A Statistical Summary, 1975. Washington D.C.: EEOC.

United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
1979 Elementary-Secondary Staff Information (EEO-5). Washington, D.C.: EEOC.

United States Equal Employment Opportunity Commission
1981 Minorities and Women in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools, A Statistical Summary, 1981. Washington D.C.: EEOC.

Valverde, L.
1980 "Promotion Socialization: The Informal Process in Large Urban Districts and its Adverse Effects on non-Whites and Women." Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership 1, 1: 36-46.

Vergon, C.
1983 "Women in Administration: A Legal Perspective." Title IX Line Center for Sex Equity in the Schools 3, 2: 12-14. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, School of Education.