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There continues to be a discrepancy in the number of females occupying the superintendent position in the United States. In Illinois, 24% of superintendents are female while 75% educators are female. This study examined the perceived barriers of aspiring superintendents in achieving the top position in education as well as the differences between genders regarding these perceptions. Data for this study was collected through a survey of the perceptions of barriers. The 85 participants for this study either completed the survey online or on paper.

Based on frequency distribution analysis, 12 barriers were perceived as high impediments to pursuing the superintendency by women compared to four by men. In addition, statistically significant differences indicating higher levels of impediments among women in pursuing the superintendency were found in ten barriers. The ten barriers include the predominance of male candidates for administrative positions, existence of the “buddy system” in which men refer other men to jobs, doubt by those in hiring position of women’s long-term career commitment, gender bias in the screening and selection process, exclusion from informal socialization process of “Good Old Boy Network,” lack of acceptance by male administrators and staff, lack of acceptance by female administrators and staff, the belief that women must be better qualified
than men in order to obtain top-level administrative positions, lack of strong women’s network similar to the “Good Old Boy Network,” and covert sex discrimination.

The findings from this study have implications for both male and female aspirants to the superintendency. Both men and women respondents in this study acknowledged that barriers do exist for those aspiring to be a superintendent although female respondents perceived the barriers more intensely and in greater quantity. The greatest barrier for both men and women in the study addressed networking. Aspiring superintendents should seek opportunities to network and to be visible in the professional arena in order to break into informal social networks. Future studies comparing barriers perceived by both men and women should be considered.
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CHAPTER 1

THE PROBLEM WITH WOMEN IN THE SUPERINTENDENCY

Background/Rationale

In public schools, the highest position possible is that of the superintendent and it is a male-dominated position. In fact, Dobie and Hummel (2001) stated, “The school superintendency is the most male-dominated position within the field of education” (p. 22).

Furthermore, the U.S. Census Bureau has characterized the superintendency as the most male-dominated executive position of any profession in the United States (Glass, 1992). In a 1992 study, 72% of educators were reported to be women while only 13.2% of superintendents were women (Glass, 1992). Another study conducted by Glass in 2000 found that of the 13,728 school superintendents in the United States, 11,744 were men and 1,984 were women.

The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) conducts the most comprehensive study of the American school superintendent every decade. The most recent ten-year examination of the profession by the AASA, entitled The American School Superintendent: 2010 Decennial Study, found that while 75% of all teachers are female, only 24% of superintendents are female (Kowalski, McCord, Petersen, Young, & Ellerson, 2010). This was an increase from the 2000 Study of the American Superintendent (Glass, et. al., 2000), which
found 13% of superintendents were female. A mid-decade update was released in 2015 by the AASA (Finnan, et al., 2016), which indicated that while increases have been made throughout the years, females only make up 27% of the superintendency. This is an increase from the 2010 decennial study but still remains in stark contrast to the female-dominated teaching profession.

In 2014, the AASA conducted a Superintendents’ Salary and Benefits Study that found “respondents arrayed by gender favoring males over females in a slightly more than three to one ratio which is consistent to the respondents in the 2010 study” (Finnan, McCord, Stream, Petersen, & Ellerson, 2015). According to Grogan and Shakeshaft (2011):

Sources indicate that although the representation of women in school leadership has increased, women still do not fill administrative positions in proportion to their numbers in teaching, or in proportion to those who are now trained and certified to become administrators. (p. 28)

Although recent research (1970 to present) indicates an upward trend in the number of females accessing administrative positions (Mertz, 2003; Mertz & McNeely, 1988; Tallerico & Blount, 2004), there is still a disproportionate underrepresentation of women nationwide in educational administration (Bell & Chase, 1993; Grogan, 1999). In fact, Skrla (1999) concluded that men are forty times more likely than women to advance from teaching to the superintendency.

Furthermore, Grogan and Shakeshaft (2011) purport that at an average annual increase of 0.7%, it will take another 77 years for women to be proportionally represented in the superintendency.

According to Shakeshaft (1987):

The percentage of women in school administration in the 1980s was less than the percentage of women in 1905. Women have seldom attained the most powerful and
prestigious administrative positions in schools, and the gender structure of males as managers and females as workers has remained relatively stable for the past 100 years. Historical record, then, tells us that there never was a golden age for women administrators, only a promise unfulfilled. (p. 51)

So what contributes to this disparity? This study investigates whether gender differences exist with regards to barriers in occupying the top district position.

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this study is based on the gatekeeping theory conceptually defined by Kurt Lewin (1947, 1951), revisited by Shoemaker (1991), and a feminist perspective as defined by Reinharz (1992) and Grogan (1996, 1999). Also, Kanter’s (1977) structural theory suggests that organizational structures shape the gender composition of leaders at the top, so this theory is also included.

Gatekeeping Theory

Gatekeeping theory was developed by Lewin (1947, 1951) and broadened by Shoemaker (1991). It was developed as a theory based on a series of channels and gatekeepers as a way of understanding how one could produce widespread social changes in a community. Lewin studied changing the food habits of a population and he concluded that not all members of the population are equally important in determining what is eaten. He also concluded that social change could best be accomplished by concentrating on those people with the most control over food selection for the family. Lewin explained that food reaches the family table through various channels such
as grocery stores or family gardens. The entrance to the channel and to each section is a “gate,” and one or more “gatekeepers” (Lewin, 1951) control movement within the channel. He concluded that homemakers were the key “gatekeepers” who controlled what food entered the “channels” that ultimately end up on the dining room table. Once in the home, the gatekeeper evaluates where the food should be stored, how it should be prepared, and ultimately whether to place it onto the table. Lewin (1951) believed that his framework could be applied generally:

This situation holds not only for food channels but also for the traveling of news items through certain communication channels in a group, for movement of goods, and the social locomotion of individuals in many organizations. (p. 187)

Lewin further applied his theory to other social systems that have characteristics of a channel, gate, and gatekeeper. He noted:

Discrimination against minorities will not be changed as long as the forces are not changed which determine the decisions of the gatekeepers. Their decisions depend partly on their ideology – that is, their system of values and beliefs that determine what they consider to be ‘good’ or ‘bad’… We then see that there are executives or boards who decide who is taken into the organization or who is kept out of it, who is promoted, and so on. (p. 186)

Shoemaker (1991) amplified Lewin’s theory to tell us that gatekeeping processes involve more complexities than impartial sets of rules and individual gatekeepers’ decision making. Shoemaker emphasized the importance of also recognizing the influence held by a profession’s routines and organizational norms, stating “Although individuals and routine practices generally determine what gets past the gate and how it is presented, organizations hire gatekeepers and make the rules” (p. 53). School boards hire consultant firms and establish the criteria for the
“ideal” candidate. Consultants, in turn, represent the school board’s interests in the gatekeeping process, making the critical decisions as to who advances through the channels according to informal and formally established criteria.

Applying Lewin (1947, 1951) and Shoemaker’s (1991) theory of channels and gatekeepers to accessing the superintendency means viewing the superintendent selection process as a process involving the passage of applicants through a variety of channels. The channels begin with the applicant perceiving that the attempt of movement through the channels as possible. In this research, the applicability of gatekeeping theory to accessing the superintendency were used to examine perceived barriers that prevent women from gaining access to the top level of leadership within a school system. Data was gathered and analyzed to determine if women perceive these “gates” as being open to them and whether this perceived barrier prevents female candidates from applying for superintendent positions.

Feminist Perspective

According to Grogan (1996), “A feminist perspective is one that recognizes that there are social inequalities which rest on gender difference” (p. 21). The feminist movement and feminist research attempts to integrate female perspectives into social reality (Reinharz, 1992). This study used a feminist perspective to examine barriers perceived by women in their attempt to secure a superintendent position. This framework was based on the feminist view that women have not been given opportunities for advancement in education and other professions equal to their male
peers. “The idea that superintendent is synonymous with man has emerged in the discourse of educational administration, due to the overwhelming number of men who have held the job and the association of traditional male leadership attributes with the role” (Grogan, 1999, p. 201).

Through survey questions, the researcher gathered information regarding the perception of barriers to upward mobility into the superintendent position. Although these questions were posed to both male and female respondents, analysis of the data contains a feminist perspective regarding differences in perceived barriers.

**Structural Theory**

Kanter (1977) suggested organizational structures shape the gender composition of the leaders at the top. Kanter’s structural theory can be incorporated into the educational organization by considering this organization as its own set of social structures.

According to Kanter’s (1977) framework of explanations for organizational behavior, gender differences do not exist; the causes for the disparity are the result of differences in ambition, mobility, work style, efficacy, and location within the organization’s social structure. Meyerson and Fletcher (2000) supported this with evidence of a glass ceiling within the organizational structure of the superintendency. They suggest:

It’s not the ceiling that’s holding women back, it’s the whole structure of the organization in which we work; the foundation, the beams, the walls, the very air. The barriers to advancement are not just above women, they are all around them… we must ferret out the hidden barriers to equity and effectiveness one by one. (p. 136)
Kanter (1977) would agree. The structural conditions actually shape gender differences in organizations. People in low-mobility or blocked-mobility positions tend to limit their aspirations, seek satisfaction in activities outside of work, dream of escape, and create sociable peer groups in which interpersonal relationships take precedence over other aspects of work. This seems to happen regardless of gender and is considered a structural phenomenon. In contrast, people at the upward levels of organizations tend to be more motivated, involved, and interested in their jobs than those at the lower levels.

On the surface, this theory may suggest that women have limited aspirations. Kanter (1977), however, concluded that the more advantageously one is placed within an organization; the more likely the person is to maintain higher aspirations and to be encouraged in keeping them. When people are faced with advancement opportunities, they begin seeing themselves associated with peers above them, known as anticipatory socialization (Kanter, 1977). Thus, it can be concluded that initial placement in an opportunity structure helps determine whether a person will develop the aspirations and orientations that make further mobility possible, regardless of gender.

Together, gatekeeping theory, feminist perspective, and structural theory form the theoretical framework for this study.
Statement of the Problem

Research shows that only a small percentage of women advance into the superintendent position despite the fact that the majority of teachers are women (Blount, 1998; Brunner, 1999; Grogan, 1996). Understanding whether differences exist between perceived barriers held by men and women helps us to determine if perceived barriers are a factor in preventing women from moving into the superintendent position. If there is no difference in the perceived barriers held between men and women, then other factors may be the cause of the lack of representation of women in the superintendency. Due to the lack of research on whether or not there exists a difference between perceived barriers held by women and perceived barriers held by men, we cannot rule out this as a contributing factor to the gender disparity in the superintendency. The purpose of this study is to compare perceived barriers held by men and women with regards to aspirations to the superintendent position.

Research Questions

Research questions explored in this study are:

1) To what extent do aspiring superintendents perceive barriers in their upward mobility toward the position of superintendent as measured by the Aspiring Superintendents’ Perceived Barriers Questionnaire?
2) To what extent do the barriers in upward mobility toward the position of superintendent that women perceive differ from the barriers that men perceive as measured by the Aspiring Superintendents’ Perceived Barriers Questionnaire?

Definition of Terms

Throughout this study, a number of key terms are used:

1. Barrier – an obstacle that obstructs or impedes progress towards a goal.

2. Superintendent – the administrative head of a public school district with responsibility for supervision and management of all aspects of operation.

3. Career Advancement – a path of progress through a person’s career.

4. Gatekeeper – an “individual or group that has the power to make decisions between what’s in or out” (Lewin, 1951, p. 186).

5. Search Consultant – “individuals or firms that help school boards find, attract, and select the district’s new school superintendent” (Tallerico, 2000, p. 18).

6. Mentoring – the practice of an individual serving as a guide and advisor to aid in professional growth and advancement.

7. Gender – the state of being male or female (typically used with reference to social and cultural differences rather than biological ones).

8. Aspiring Superintendent – someone currently enrolled in a superintendent preparation program or someone who holds a superintendent endorsement and/or an educational
administrator with the potential to become a superintendent given the proper context and circumstances.

9. Buddy System – a cooperative arrangement where two persons help each other succeed and advance.

10. Good Old Boy Network – a group of men practicing cronyism in order to help each other succeed and advance.

11. Glass Ceiling – an “intangible barrier within a hierarchy that prevents women or minorities from obtaining upward-level positions” (Merriam-Webster Dictionary).

Delimitations of the Study

The following delimitations created the boundaries for this study. First, due to the nature of my study, only current administrators who aspire to the superintendency were studied. Furthermore, only aspiring superintendents from the state of Illinois were part of the research.

Limitations

This study is limited by the following factors. First, the ability to generalize is limited because of the number of participants in this study. The study is limited by external factors such as race. Furthermore, this study is subject to limitations recognized in using surveys to collect data, specifically the inability to confirm the identity of the participant taking the online survey. Lastly this study is limited to aspiring superintendents from public school districts.
Administrators of parochial, charter, or other non-public school entities were not considered for this study.

Assumptions

Basic assumptions of this research study were:

1. Participants completed the online/paper survey themselves.
2. Participants were current administrators in the state of Illinois at the time the survey was completed.
3. Participants were able to understand the survey.
4. Participants responded honestly.
5. Participants were concerned with contributing to a body of research that could be helpful to aspiring superintendents.

Significance of the Study

It is important to examine the disparity in the number of women superintendents for several reasons. First, the future ensures abundant superintendent vacancies and, therefore, opportunities for women to advance into these positions (Tallerico, 2000). According to Glass, in 1992 a majority of the nation’s 15,000 school districts would need to hire a new superintendent within the next five years. A 2010 survey by the AASA (Kowalski et al., 2010) found that 50% of working superintendents planned to retire by 2016. Retirement age in most states is 55 and the
average superintendent is 54 years old. This mass exodus will provide multiple opportunities for females interested in obtaining these positions to be prepared.

Another reason to understand if gender differences exist in perceived barriers to accessing the superintendency is that the majority of students presently gaining educational administration certification are females (Shakeshaft, 1989). Since having an administrative certificate is part of the process of obtaining a superintendent position (Grogan, 1996), understanding why more women are not successful in reaching this position and whether perceived barriers is a factor is essential in order to find remedy.

Furthermore, as more women fill central office positions, including the position of assistant superintendent, more females should ultimately obtain the top position in a school district (Schmuck & Wyant, 1981). According to Brunner and Grogan (2005), however, research has shown that this has not occurred. This research indicates that only a fraction of the superintendency positions have been filled by women despite the greater number of women moving into central office positions.

Although there is quite a bit of qualitative research that examines female superintendents and the barriers that were faced in ascending to the superintendency, there is a need for more quantitative research regarding the underrepresentation of women at the top level of educational administration. This descriptive study adds to the knowledge base in this area, as well as providing insight into possible gender differences in perceived barriers held by aspiring superintendents.
Summary

Both men and women seeking the superintendency confront barriers and challenges in their upward mobility, but to what extent? The purpose of this study is to answer the question of whether the barriers perceived by men and women differ. Due to the lack of research on whether or not there exists a difference between perceived barriers held by men and women, we cannot rule this out as a contributing factor to the gender disparity in the superintendency. Although literature has emerged documenting perceived barriers of women, perceived barriers of men have not been acknowledged in research.

Lewin’s gatekeeping theory, a feminist perspective, and Kanter’s structural theory formed the theoretical framework for this study. School boards, consultant firms, and current superintendents act as gatekeepers making the critical decisions as to who advances through the channels that lead to a superintendent position. The feminist view that women have not been given equal opportunities for advancement in education is considered as well as Kanter’s views on organizational structures and how they shape gender compositions of the leaders at the top.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Upon her appointment as the first female superintendent of Chicago Public Schools, over a hundred years ago, Ella Flagg Young was hopeful about the future of women in the superintendency:

Women are destined to rule the schools of every city. I look for a majority of big cities to follow the lead of Chicago in choosing a woman for superintendent. In the near future, we will have more women than men in executive charge of the vast educational system. It is a woman’s natural field, as she is no longer satisfied to do the greatest part of the work and yet be denied leadership. As the first woman to be placed in control of the schools of a big city, it will be my aim to prove that no mistake has been made and to show cities and friends alike that a woman is better qualified for this work than a man. (qtd. in by Shakeshaft, 1987, p. 18)

Despite this optimism by Young, the reality is that women have never dominated public school administration, although women still dominate the field of teaching (Bell & Chase, 1993; Blount, 1998; Brunner, 1999; Grogan, 1996; Mertz, 2003; Shakeshaft, 1989). According to Grogan (1999), 85% of teachers in the United States are women, but females only account for 37% of assistant or associate superintendents and only 10% of superintendents. The most recent AASA
survey done, *The American School Superintendent: 2010 Decennial Study*, found only 24% of superintendents were female (Kowalski et al., 2010).

The purpose of this chapter is to review literature and research relevant to the lack of females in the position of superintendent in the United States. The literature readily lends itself to being divided into six main sections. The first section provides the reader with an overview of the position of superintendent. The second section reviews the history of women in public school superintendency positions in the United States. The next section of the literature review briefly outlines career advancement of female administrators and includes research on the “glass ceiling.” The fourth section examines leadership styles and the differences between the way men and women lead. Then the literature review contains an examination of current research regarding the superintendent candidate selection process, gatekeepers, and what barriers exist for women in the process. Lastly an overview is given of relevant research regarding barriers to the superintendency.

In reviewing this literature, a gap in quantitative research became apparent regarding gender differences in perceived barriers in career advancement towards the superintendency. More specifically, further research is needed regarding what barriers exist for men and women and how those perceived barriers differ.
The State of the Superintendency

The public school superintendency is a complex and multifaceted position. Today’s superintendent must be an effective decision maker. He or she must possess strong financial, operational, and political leadership skills while also being equipped in leading curriculum and instruction (Dana & Bourisaw, 2006a). School district superintendents today work in an increasingly high-stakes environment full of adversity (Patterson, 2007). Oftentimes, superintendents must lead in an environment in which they are isolated, where the responsibilities are numerous, and where they have limited number of allies and supports (Glass & Franceschini, 2007). The superintendent must be prepared to juggle a variety of stakeholders, including administrative teams, school boards, community members, parents, teachers, labor unions, and one’s own family. All superintendents today are faced with ever increasing accountability to both state and federal governments while typically acquiring fewer resources to do the job. The superintendent must also be able to delegate authority to subordinates with specific duties and expertise (Sharp & Walter, 2004).

Superintendents are the CEOs of public school districts, and just as in the corporate world, most of these positions are held by men. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, today’s average superintendent is a married, White male between 51 and 55 years old (Glass, 2000). By examining the history of hiring in administration, it appears that women who aspire to this level
still remain at a disadvantage. Although there are more women in education, the administrative ranks still remain predominantly male (Alston, 2000).

In the 2014 AASA Superintendents Salary and Benefit Study (Finnan et al., 2015), 1,711 superintendents from around the country were surveyed. Of those that responded, 1,347 were male superintendents (78.7%) while only 351 were female superintendents (20.5%). Several findings from this study were noteworthy regarding the superintendency and gender. First, female participation fell by approximately 2% while male participation in the study grew by the same amount. When considering gender and the perceived economic conditions of districts, female superintendents lead districts with greater economic challenges than do their male counterparts. A little more than 20% of the male superintendents and 25% of the female superintendents have a severance clause in their contract. While almost twice as many female superintendents reported a salary cap compared to male superintendents. Also notable, female superintendents were found to be older than male superintendents in both mean and median data (Finnan et al., 2015).

Historical Overview of Female Superintendent Research

In order to fully understand the superintendency and the dominant gender within it, a brief review of the original structure of teaching is imperative. Men dominated the teaching profession in the early 1800s, working by themselves in schoolhouses throughout the United States. By the mid-1800s, an interesting trend in educational employment developed in parallel
with the emergence of female teachers. Local and state officials created the domain of school administration. These positions were originally reserved for men. Men were seen as the authority figures, controlling the labors of women just as fathers and husbands had done in the home (Blount, 1998).

In his article, “Women in the Superintendency: Advances in Research and Theory,” Bjork (2000) outlines six stages of research regarding gender disparities in the superintendency. The first stage of research focused on descriptive information about the number of women serving as school and district administrators. In 1998, Blount published a historical analysis of women in the superintendency from 1873-1995. This publication provided insight into the disparity between male and female superintendents over an extended period of time and highlights the importance of research regarding what barriers female candidates face in their quest for the ultimate position in education. Later in the 1800s, the male/female ratios of teachers were nearly balanced, but by the early 1900s, women held 70% of all teaching positions. The peak emerged in 1920, with 86% of all school positions held by women and only 14% held by men (Blount, 1998). Findings from this study found that women held between 9% and 11% of all superintendent positions from 1910 to 1950. As male administrators assumed more control in education, male teachers either left teaching or found ways to enter the predominantly male world of administration quicker. The aftermath of World War II had an impact on the proportion of women in educational administration as well. The G.I. Bill of Rights provided grants for scholastic expenses and drastically increased the proportion of males in superintendency.
positions because many men used these funds to obtain administrative credentials and thus respectable salaries. Not only had men been enticed into education, but they also had been tracked into leadership positions at the expense of women’s opportunities and often with federal government support (Blount, 1998). From 1950 to 1970, representation of women in the superintendency dramatically declined to 3%. From 1970 to 1990, women made minimal gains in attaining the position, increasing from 3% to 5%. The percentage of women superintendents stayed at that level until climbing to 6.6% in 1992 (Glass, 1992) and then doubling to 13.2% in 1999, the highest level achieved during the 20th century (Glass, 2000).

The second stage of research investigated and chronicled the lives and accomplishments of successful female superintendents early in the 20th century. This examination of noteworthy women in the superintendency is a key part of the literature on women and gender. According to Bjork (2000), “There is broad consensus that it not only is contributing to a more complete picture of women in school leadership, but also is stimulating considerable debate within the field of educational administration” (p. 8).

In the 1970s and 1980s, the third stage of research began and raised issues related to the barriers that exist for women aspiring to become superintendents. This third stage brought about significant research, including Shakeshaft’s (1989) influential work exploring how discrimination, stereotypes, and gender bias limit a woman’s progress and access to educational administration. This research led to Tallerico (1999) investigating the role of search consultants as gatekeepers to the superintendency. Tallerico’s research suggests that the absence of women
in the superintendency may have less to do with a woman’s lack of training, availability, or presence in an administrative cohort than with other factors related to the search and selection process. In her article, “Gaining Access to the Superintendency: Headhunting, Gender, and Color,” Tallerico (2000) examines the role of gatekeepers to the superintendency. This research helps with our understanding of the factors associated with promoting gender as well as factors that inhibit the process. The work sheds light on biases of search consultants and board members and how they influence the selection criteria and shape superintendent search and selection processes.

The fourth stage of research emerged in the 1990s. This research uses a female perspective to guide research on women’s experiences in administration. From the woman’s point of view, we see how women superintendents perceive, construct, and enact their roles in a male-dominated profession. Many common attributes of women leaders were identified in these studies. These attributes highlight the differences in the way men and women lead. Cryss Brunner’s (2000) groundbreaking work in the study, “Unsettled Moments in Settled Discourse: Women Superintendents’ Experiences of Inequality,” highlighted female superintendents’ experiences with inequality in their work at the highest levels of decision making in America’s public schools. Brunner’s findings fell into three major categories: the nature of gender bias; women’s role in perpetuating gender bias; and issues of power, silence, style, responsibility, and relations with people. Most importantly, Brunner’s findings reveal that dominant male notions shaped the behavior of women superintendents.
The fifth stage of research focuses on the effectiveness of women in educational administration. Research, as a result of this stage, “provides a rich and descriptive storehouse of human female administrative behavior” (Shakeshaft, 1987, p. 115) that advances our perceptions about the meaning of gender. Margaret Grogan’s (2000) article, “Laying the Groundwork for a Reconception of the Superintendency from Feminist Postmodern Perspectives,” conveys the notion that women need to become a part of the discourse of professional preparation so that they may assume their place in the superintendency. What women bring to the superintendency are characteristics currently missing but needed in school reform. These approaches to performing the job of the superintendent are essential (Bjork, 2000).

The last stage of research focuses on understanding women’s and men’s experiences together. The research suggests that we develop an understanding of leadership that is sensitive to differences in gender, ethnicity, and race (Bjork, 2000). This stage of research urges the redefinition of “the superintendency and building theory rather than simply corroborating generalizations affirmed by the dominant paradigm” (p. 13). It also affirms the need for additional research on women’s use of power as well as causes for the underrepresentation of women in the superintendency.

Women in the Superintendency

The disparity between men and women in the superintendency is paradoxical; the field of education is dominated by women serving as teachers, elementary principals, and central office
administrators, yet men dominate the superintendency. Thus, the limited number of women in
the highest position of a school district is a concern for females aspiring to the superintendency.
Women comprise 51% of the total population in the United States and therefore it would be
reasonable to assume women would also comprise 51% of superintendent positions (Shakeshaft,
1998). Women are overrepresented in teaching and underrepresented in administration
(Shakeshaft, 1999).

Recent research (Blount, 1998; Mertz, 2003; Tallerico & Blount, 2004) has provided
evidence of an upward trend of the number of females moving into educational administration.
Data from Mertz’s (2003) longitudinal study on women in educational administration reported a
significant movement of females into all administrative positions in school districts, with the
exception of the position of superintendent. Data was collected over a 30-year period and
explored whether women had continued to advance. In the AASA Study of the American
Superintendent: 2015 Mid-Decade Update (Finnan et al., 2015), females made up 27% of the
superintendents in the nation, which was only up 2% from the 2010 decennial study conducted
by the AASA (Kowalski, et al., 2010). This stands in direct contrast the female-dominated
teaching force.

Although women make up the minority in the superintendency, they are older, have had
more experience in education and are more highly educated than their male counterparts
(Tallerico, 2000). These findings were similar to what the AASA reported in their 2015 mid-decade update (Finnan et al., 2015). This study found that the mean and median age is higher for
female superintendents than their male counterparts. Tallerico also found that women have more teaching experience (average of 15 years) in comparison to men (average of 5 years). This was also the case with the findings from the AASA 2015 mid-decade study, which reported that female superintendents generally spent more years as classroom teachers than did male superintendents (Finnan et al., 2015). This typically means that women are applying for their first superintendent positions later in life, which also is substantiated by the 2015 AASA mid-decade study. Although school boards and consultants contend to not practice age discrimination, 50 years old is considered by many as the end of a career path, not the time to start looking for a superintendency position (Tallerico, 2000). Women are also found to be more highly educated, with 52% of female superintendents holding doctoral degrees in comparison to only 41% of men (Glass, 2000).

The Role of Gender

Throughout the literature, gender has predominately been defined separately from one’s sex (Doyle, 1985). The two terms, often used synonymously, are actually quite different and convey two divergent meanings. Many researchers collectively agree that gender is a term that involves cultural and/or societal influences upon the sexes, which are then defined as masculine or feminine (Doyle, 1985; Grogan, 1996; Shakeshaft, 1989; Skrła et al., 2000; Tallerico, 2000). Conversely, sex only deals with the biological functions and structures or physical characteristics that make one male or female (Doyle, 1985).
Gender behaviors have been associated as being solely male or female. They have furthermore been socially constructed and have become accepted as societal norms (Skrla et al., 2000). Grogan (1996) explains that superintendents are invariably viewed as being a man superintendent or a woman superintendent and that one’s gender is inextricably intertwined and not easily removed from the role itself. Grogan further advances that gender ideals, or biases, can set up an oppositional relationship between a woman superintendent and her board, colleagues, and/or community members. Tallerico (2000) supports this by affirming that gender issues can put women at a disadvantage in terms of how they choose to act because their critical influences are beyond the women’s control. Brunner (2000) also supports Grogan’s (1996) theory that women are always women in the role of superintendent and that their gender is never disassociated from the role they have assumed.

Shakeshaft (1989) introduced the phrase androcentric bias, which she defines as examining the world and its perceived reality from a male lens. Androcentric bias furthers the argument that gender bias does exist and that it is a valid issue that must be addressed to ensure equality for women seeking such a predominantly male-dominated profession. Shakeshaft also asserts that curricula typically included in educational leadership preparation programs are gender biased in that their ideologies are based on observations and assumptions formulated largely by males about the male experience. From the perspective of Shakeshaft and Grogan (2000), much of the literature is based on male ideals or thought processes, may promote gender
bias, and may be disadvantageous to men and women as they progress and perceive women in
the field.

What is of interest is how women themselves react to researchers when studies are
conducted to gain insight into women’s own personal experiences in the role of superintendent.
Both Brunner (2000) and Skrla et al. (2000) note that women often silence themselves in talking
about or even acknowledging gender issues or bias in their professional experiences. Further
studies suggest that women avoid discussing or associating gender issues with themselves and
the position as superintendent in order to negate any negative connotations (Brunner, 1999;
Grogan, 1996; Tallerico, 2000).

Career Advancement and Gender

Only a small number of women advance into the position of superintendent despite the
fact that the majority of teachers are women (Blount, 1998; Brunner, 1999; Grogan, 1996), thus
supporting the perception of a “glass ceiling.” The “glass ceiling” concept is an important topic
in research on women in administrative roles. This concept describes the invisible barrier many
women administrators hit when attempting to progress forward in administration. Meier and
Wilkins (2002) determined that school districts are classic glass-ceiling organizations. They
conducted a quantitative research study of 1,000 school districts in Texas assessing gender
discrimination in superintendent salaries. Meier and Wilkins found evidence that supports subtle
gender differences in salaries of superintendents but discovered that female superintendents replacing male superintendents receive lower compensation.

Career Pathways

Over the last 25 years, there has been a significant increase in the number of women who are preparing for careers in educational administration. Gender equity legislation has been enacted; however, women continue to be underrepresented in top administrative positions. In their 1995 book *Out of Women’s Experience: Creating Relational Leadership*, Regan and Brooks refer to legislative responses to gender equity and the effect the legislation has on female advancement in education. They assert that gender equity concerns that have been addressed by legislation have done more to affect women’s aspirations than they have affected employment practices of educational institutions.

Glass (2000) lists seven reasons why women’s career mobility path to the superintendency is still low. These seven reasons include: (1) women are not in career positions (i.e., high school principals, athletic directors, etc.) that normally lead to advancement into the superintendency; (2) women are not preparing for the superintendency; (3) women are not as experienced nor as interested in fiscal management as men; (4) personal relationships hold women back; (5) school boards are hesitant to hire women superintendents; (6) women enter the field of education for different reasons today; and (7) women enter administration at an older age.
Site-level experience can also inadvertently limit women in their career pathways. Most superintendents begin their careers as teachers, move into site-level administration and then onto district administration prior to attaining the superintendency. This was substantiated in the Study of the American Superintendent: 2015 Mid-Decade Update conducted by the AASA (Finnan et al., 2015). The findings from this study reported that the majority of superintendents’ career paths followed the tradition of teacher to site administrator to assistant superintendent to superintendent. However, according to a study done by Sharp and Walter (2004), 31% transitioned directly from site-level administration into the superintendency. Men especially make this leap from the high school principalship. The 2015 AASA mid-decade study did find that the traditional trend was also interrupted in the smaller districts where positions like assistant superintendent are not available along the career path. Females have sometimes been considered at a disadvantage if their principalship experience has been at the elementary level instead of the high-school level (Sharp & Walter, 2004). Wolverton and MacDonald’s (2001) research found that more high school principalships are held by men than women, and many believe the high school principalship is the position that most clearly resembles the superintendency.

**Mentoring**

Mentoring may also be a barrier to a female’s career mobility path to the superintendency. Ramsey (2000), in her study on domestic relationships of the superintendency, found that women have a tendency to have less developed mentoring systems. She goes on to
imply that this may be the reason women aspiring to the superintendency are not provided with more in-district mobility opportunities. Although there seems to be a shortage of superintendent candidates on the horizon, few male superintendents are mentoring female subordinates to fill the shortage. Women tend to remain in teaching longer than their male counterparts before trying to obtain an administrative position. According to Sharp, Malone, Walter, and Supley (2004), boards of education tend to have more male members than female, and superintendents are hired by boards of education. The researchers further go on to suggest, “Where females are in a majority on the board of education, female superintendents tend to be hired more often” (p. 26).

Aspirations

Aspiration may also play a role in a woman’s career advancement into the superintendency. Brunner and Grogan (2005) conducted a study commissioned by the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) on female superintendents. They looked at female top central office administrators who were poised to move into the superintendency but were not aspiring to the role. Their study focused on the “largely untapped resource of qualified women superintendent candidates and asserts the position that not only are women underutilized, but also due to numerous factors, may lack the aspiration to pursue the positions” (p. 2). The data from that study revealed the primary reasons non-aspiring women give for not aspiring to the superintendency. The top four reasons indicated were satisfaction with current position and no interest in changing jobs (58%), politics of the job do not appeal to them (43.7%), high level of
stress of superintendent positions (32.4%), and superintendent’s salary not high enough for
weight of the job (21%; p. 39). Interestingly, these researchers found that the primary reasons
that non-aspiring women gave for not seeking the superintendency was not related to
childrearing or family obligations. The perception that family responsibilities impede career
advancements for women has dominated discourse over the years. Brunner and Grogan found
that both non-aspirants and aspirants to the superintendency are most often raising or have raised
children.

Additional research by Grogan (1996) focused on 27 women who were aspiring to the
superintendency. The qualitative study examined what makes women believe that they are
qualified to be superintendents. Furthermore, the study examined what strengths and leadership
skills women would bring to the position. Grogan found that although candidates are expected to
have a high level of training and credible prior experiences as an administrator, women in this
study felt that other experiences (instructional leadership at the building and district levels,
districtwide program development, supervision of personnel, budget management, and relational
and interpersonal approaches to leadership) had equally prepared them for the superintendency.
Further findings from this study highlighted examples of a gendered environment in educational
administration, including aspects of the job influencing administrative styles, the absence of
presence of support groups and mentoring, and how marital status and other issues of sexuality
have an impact on the lives of women administrators. Grogan’s study found that women
aspirants to the superintendency are seen as women first and administrators second. Conclusions
from this study provided a background against which to understand women who aspire to the superintendency.

**Career Barriers**

Kowalski and Stouder (1999) conducted key research focused on whether female superintendents had encountered career barriers that were thought to obstruct female applicants. The study was based on 13 female superintendents in the state of Indiana who were employed in the position in the spring of 1997. The findings showed that three of the women superintendents (23%) reported not having encountered any of the eight barriers identified by Glass (2000): lack of family support, lack of employment opportunities, gender discrimination; lack of collegial support, family responsibilities, lack of self-confidence; racial/ethnic discrimination, personal lack of tenacity. All 13 female superintendents reported not having experienced three of the barriers (lack of family support, lack of collegial support, and racial/ethnic discrimination). One of the conclusions of the study (Kowalski & Strouder, 1999) indicated that the reason these female superintendents reported a low incidence of career barriers was because of the subtleness of the barriers.
Gatekeepers

A discussion on female career advancement in educational administration would not be complete without reviewing the work of Tallerico (2000). Tallerico examined the role of gatekeepers to the superintendency; school boards and professional search firms. She found that although encouragement and support of women appear to be increasing, individual acts by consultants and board of education members have neither altered organizational practices nor enhanced the social responsibility essential to changing the male-dominated system. Tallerico used Lewin’s (1947) gatekeeping theory to explain women’s access to the superintendency. Tallerico (2000) stated that at each point in the superintendent search process there are gates that filter the candidate in or out. Decision makers, who are constrained by norms attached to certain educational administration positions, control the gates. As an example, gates tend to be closed or only partially open to candidates whose experience consists primarily of elementary principalships. Elementary principal positions tend to have a higher number of females than males while high school principals often are male. The high school principalship is often a place where many superintendent candidates are found and courted. Sharp et al. (2004) noted that most positions leading to the superintendency are from secondary schools or the central office.

Furthermore, Tallerico’s (2000) data, in “Gaining Access to the Superintendency: Headhunting, Gender and Color,” further supports the idea that women may be discouraged from even applying to superintendent positions. The qualitative study, which involved interviews with
men and women superintendents, recruiters (job hiring companies) and school board members, states women can be disadvantaged in obtaining the role of superintendent by a mixture of unwritten selection criteria. Using gatekeeping (which puts applicants through a series of flow channels) and career mobility (how men and women differ in the cultural, personal, and socialization factors) theories as a theoretical framework, Tallerico concludes that those criteria include decisions based on school boards’ and headhunters’ preferences to define quality of applicants in terms of assigned hierarchies to particular job titles and stereotype applicants by gender, and boards’ tendency to “hyper value feelings of comfort and interpersonal chemistry with the successful candidate” (p. 37).

After addressing school board tendencies to hire professional consulting firms (which favor male candidates) and to hire final candidates who are most like them, Tallerico (2000) suggests a strong need for professional development of school boards. By raising board members’ awareness of the factors that limit diversity in candidate pools, boards can become more sensitive and proactive in providing equitable access to all potential candidates.

Chase and Bell (1990) determined that gatekeepers’ speech about women’s actions and situations was one of the processes that continued to contribute to the male dominance in the profession. Some examples were cited by Chase and Bell where board members were asked by their consultants such questions as, “Is this district ready for a woman? Is this board ready for a female superintendent?” These questions are blatantly biased and potentially prejudicial to the entire search process (Tallerico, 2000). Tallerico concluded that without professional
development that increases awareness of existing biases, these gatekeepers will continue to suppress women’s ascension to the top of educational organizations.

Leadership Style and Gender

School boards may hire men because they are perceived to be more directive and authoritative. School boards looking for strong instructional leaders, however, may hire women because they are perceived as instructionally strong. This theory was substantiated in both the Study of the American Superintendent: 2010 Decennial Study (Kowalski, et al., 2010) as well as the Study of the American Superintendent: 2015 Mid-Decade Update (Finnan et al., 2015). These studies indicated that female superintendents were hired for their curriculum knowledge and instructional leadership skills, whereas male superintendents were hired for their personal characteristics.

The extent to which men and women actually lead differently is disputed. In their book, Bolman and Deal (2003) investigated men and women leaders utilizing the four frames of leadership (human resources, structural, symbolic, and political). They found no differences in frame orientation between men and women. Bolman and Deal actually found that the subordinates in administrative positions viewed men and women leaders more alike than different. Bolman and Deal discovered the only difference between men and women was that women tended to be more democratic or participative than men.
In the article “Gender in Theory and Practice of Educational Leadership,” in which the authors interviewed 27 women superintendents, their husbands, school board members, and administrative staff members to examine how gender affected the women’s leadership strategies, Bell and Chase (1995) concluded that women do not differ in their styles compared to men, but they do differ in their strategies, and women need to be aware of gender in regard to male contexts within the work environment. They suggest this knowledge may influence how women move in their career paths. This difference in successful leadership practices is a topic echoed in Brunner’s (1998, 1999) studies as well.

Brunner (1994) noted that women superintendents differed from men in their approach to power. Traditional viewpoints of power are rooted in domination and reflect control and power over another. Female power comes from working collaboratively with others. Brunner also found that women rarely use the term “power,” rarely see themselves as powerful, and are more likely to describe themselves with terms such as “patient,” “good listener,” and “someone who gets things done.” Other researchers have suggested that women approach the superintendency in very different ways. Funk, Pankake and Schroth (2002) described the strengths of female administrators as “including collaborative leadership, focus on curriculum and instruction, inclusion of all stakeholders in decision making processes, empowerment of teachers, students, and parents, and articulation of new missions of what school should be” (p. 2). Funk (1998) also indicated that women with new leadership styles were needed for successful school reform because of their communicative and integrative styles.
Perceptions of female and male leaders also differ. Women are perceived as being collaborative and nurturing while men are perceived as being authoritative and decisive. Thus, while women are valued as instructional leaders, having expertise in curriculum and instruction, men are valued for their assumed financial prowess and perceived ability to be able to handle any situation. A feminist perspective recognizes that these social inequalities exist based on gender differences and other’s perceptions.

In Sacred Dreams, Brunner (1999) found that women superintendents “articulated and carried out gender-specific strategies [for success] which created, in part, their support while in the superintendency” (p. 181). She defined success as women superintendents whom others deemed capable, effective, respected, and well liked. Brunner, in a 1998 study in which she interviewed 12 women superintendents, found female gender-specific strategies that successful women superintendents possessed. These included: (a) balancing both role and gender expectations, (b) keeping the agenda simple to focus on the care of children and their academic achievement, (c) remaining “feminine” in their communication styles while navigating the masculinized culture, (d) disregarding the concept of “acting like a man” while working in a male role; I removing anything that blocks success, (f) maintaining a fearless, “can do” attitude while also ensuring “down time” to rejuvenate, and (g) sharing power and credit.

According to Bjork (2000), there are many common attributes of women leaders that have been identified in studies over the past 30 years. This confirms the notion that women approach leadership differently than men. For example, women tend to be more caring and child
centered; they have an understanding of child development and student achievement; and they are experts at instruction and knowledge of teaching and learning. They also are regarded as being relational, community sensitive and politically perceptive and as valuing working with parents and community members. They are ethically oriented, task oriented, and problem solvers. These leadership qualities are “closely aligned with expectations for superintendents to be educational, political, and managerial leaders as well as change agents” (Johnson, 1996).

Superintendent Selection Process

Data suggest the lack of female representation in the superintendency may have less to do with their lack of training, availability, aspiration, or presence in the administrative pipeline than other factors related to the search and selection process (Glass, 2000). Most local school boards have the responsibility of appointing and hiring superintendents (Kamler & Shakeshaft, 1999; Shakeshaft, 1999). Many of these school boards use search consultants to find candidates for vacant superintendent positions. Kamler and Shakeshaft (1999) conducted a study that examined the role of the search consultant as the gatekeeper in promoting or preventing women from obtaining a superintendent position. Search consultants were interviewed for the study. Findings from the study included an increased number of women applicants for the superintendency in comparison to previous searches that the consultants had conducted, a higher ratio of male to female candidates, a significant difference between the number of women applicants applying for elementary superintendencies (K-6) and K-12 superintendencies, and a lack of female
candidates who had the experience of high school principalship, which continues to be a preferred pathway to the superintendency. Every consultant indicated that in the final field of candidates presented to the board, women candidates were always included. Women were also reported as finalists in all 75 searches, yet women filled only 12% (nine superintendents) of the vacancies. Furthermore, consultants perceived that school boards continue to have bias against women candidates for the superintendency. Finally, Kamler and Shakeshaft (1999) concluded from their study that search consultants play a major role in hiring superintendents and acting as gatekeepers.

Despite Kamler and Shakeshaft’s (1999) study, Tallerico (2000) indicated that there is little research regarding how gender affects the superintendent search and selection process. School boards make the ultimate decision about whom to hire as the superintendent in districts. According to the literature, there has also been research to support school boards using retired superintendents as consultants in the search and selection process (Magowan, 1979). As highlighted earlier, the majority of current and retired superintendents are male, so that may skew the selection process from its inception. Although Tallerico’s (2000) work is enlightening, it focuses mainly on gatekeeping theory and not on the actual selection process undertaken by school boards. Little research exists in this area and further study should be conducted. However, in Maienza’s (1986) article entitled, “The Superintendency: Characteristics of Access for Men and Women,” constructs were illustrated that inform school board’s decision making during the superintendent selection process. Some characteristics that Maienza identified affecting the
process include parental background, family’s academic experience, early socialization, and work experience. When school board members “go with their gut,” women are often at a disadvantage. According to Tallerico (2000), all stakeholders in the selection process describe the face-to-face interview as the crucial, or the “make-or-break” part of the process. When school board members “go with their gut,” numerous intangibles become part of the interview process. These intangibles, according to Lewin (1951), “assert themselves on individual power-holders’ values and attitudes, at once idiosyncratic and personal but also reflective of one’s particular background, experiences, and surrounding familiar institutional, and cultural worlds.” Inherently, these variables may contrast with professional norms and practices, putting female candidates at a disadvantage.

Relevant Barrier Research

Much of the relevant perceived and experienced barrier research has been conducted on women only. In 1992, Dr. Betty Jane Dulac conducted a quantitative study of female superintendents and male and female school board presidents in Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware using a tool that assessed their perceived barrier strategies to accessing the superintendency. Similarly, in 1998, Dr. Deanna Anderson used the same tool developed by Dulac to determine perceived barriers and strategies used by female superintendents nationwide. Both Wickham (2007) and Davis (2010) then used this same tool with female superintendents in California and North Carolina, respectively. Dr. Veronique
Walker, for her 2014 quantitative study of African American female superintendents in the United States, also used the Dulac questionnaire. Although Dulac, Anderson, Wickham, and Walker all used a quantitative research design, Davis used the survey tool in a descriptive research study.

One researcher, Dr. Becky J. Foley, conducted a qualitative study of female administrators, entitled *Breaking Barriers to Achieve the Superintendency*. Her 2015 study looked at the phenomenon of the external and internal barriers that exist for female administrators in Maine. She interviewed two current superintendents, two aspiring superintendents, and two non-aspiring female superintendents. Although only female participants were used for this study, it does differ from the other research regarding barriers perceived by women because it included female administrators who were not yet superintendents.

All of the findings from the research of Dulac, Anderson, Wickham, Walker, Davis, and Foley were used to determine significant barriers perceived by female superintendents. Each researcher also looked at strategies used by female superintendents to secure a superintendent position. The research was used to compile standard demographic profiles of the populations studied. Findings compared barriers and strategies of women of different ages, degrees, experience, career choices, types and sizes of districts, etc. Although this is beneficial research for women aspiring to the superintendency, it does not offer a comparison of barriers perceived by men and women and whether those perceived barrier differences contribute to the lack of women in the position of superintendent.
Dr. Tanesha Hunter conducted the last relevant research. The purpose of her 2013 quantitative study was to compare male and female assistant superintendents from New York and their descriptions of internal barriers, external barriers, internal motivators, external motivators, stressors, and discriminatory acts they anticipated encountering as they sought to access the superintendency. Furthermore, the research looked at whether their perceptions of these barriers influenced their willingness to pursue a superintendent position. Hunter’s study was the only research found that examined perceived barriers of both men and women. However, the research was only conducted on assistant superintendents in New York and contained more than just perceived barrier questions.

Summary

There exists quite a bit of qualitative research regarding female superintendents’ perspectives on the position. Most of the research highlights successful strategies used by current female superintendents. Because the focus of this literature review was on the career advancement of female educators to the superintendency and the barriers that exist, that research was not included. Access to the superintendency for female candidates is a multi-dimensional issue. Many factors influence the quest. Although there is research that focuses on socio-psychological reasons women do not make the move to the superintendency, this review focused more on the barriers that exist for women who aspire to make this move. The ultimate gatekeepers are school board members and there is not enough research that looks specifically at
what career anchors or characteristics members look for during the selection process (Tallerico, 2000). Do these characteristics have gender bias that may close the gate for female candidates at the beginning of the process?

The literature highlighted in this review focused on four themes: history, career advancement, leadership style, and selection process. The history of the research regarding female superintendents shows a rise, fall, and slow rise again of females occupying the top position in school districts across the United States (Blount, 1998). Blount’s six stages of research highlight what is known about this topic during the last 100 years. Mentoring and candidate preparation are popular themes in the female career advancement literature (Ramsey, 2000). Women do not receive the same mentoring opportunities as men. There does seem to be a rise in the number of females going through a superintendent preparation process, but the gates are still shut during the interview and selection process (Tallerico, 2000).

In the arena of leadership style literature, women are shown to be more collaborative and less directive. They also are found to be more instructionally strong, which may open more doors for them in the future of high-stakes testing and accountability. Districts are looking for candidates who can lead a district into an instructionally sound place. Although men are found to be stronger in the areas of finance and management, there are often supplementary positions in districts to fill these roles. Lastly this literature review looked at the selection process and the barriers that exist for female candidates. School board members are the ultimate gatekeepers in
the selection process, but little is known about what leadership characteristics they are looking for in a candidate.

Over the past several decades, research on gender in educational administration has shown how culture and professional norms have created masculine myths of the best way to lead (Brunner, 1994). This has further perpetuated expectations and gender bias in the superintendency. Studying the barriers that exist for female candidates and further looking at characteristics of desired leaders can help start the process of changing educational administration for women in the future. Also beneficial is the study of barriers experienced by current, practicing, female superintendents in order to determine if they differ from the perceived barriers. Although research exists on female superintendents and barriers that were perceived and experienced, there is little research that looks at how perceived barriers differ based on gender.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Over the past several decades, research on gender in educational administration has shown how culture and professional norms have created masculine myths of the best ways to lead. This has further perpetuated expectations and gender bias in the superintendency. Studying the perceived barriers that exist for both male and female candidates and further looking at whether these perceived barriers differ by gender can help start the process of changing educational administration for women in the future. According to the literature, there appears to be a gap in research regarding perceived barriers to upward mobility of men and women in public education. These barriers may be real or perceived by males and females hoping to advance to the highest levels of educational administration. This study focuses on the following research questions:

1) To what extent do aspiring superintendents perceive barriers in their upward mobility toward the position of superintendent as measured by the Aspiring Superintendents Perceived Barriers Questionnaire?
2) To what extent do the barriers in upward mobility toward the position of superintendent that women perceive differ from the barriers that men perceive as measured by the Aspiring Superintendents Perceived Barriers Questionnaire?

*Ho:* There are not barriers in upward mobility toward the position of superintendent that women perceive that differ from the barriers that men perceive as measured by the Aspiring Superintendents Perceived Barriers Questionnaire.

*Ha:* There are barriers in upward mobility toward the position of superintendent that women perceive that differ from the barriers that men perceive as measured by the Aspiring Superintendents Perceived Barriers Questionnaire.

Descriptive Research Design

A descriptive research design was selected for this study. This type of study was chosen in order to describe the phenomenon associated with the lack of female superintendents. The variables for this descriptive study were the perceived barrier statements originally identified by Dr. Betty Dulac (1992) and then used by Dr. Dee Anderson (1998) based on current research at the time. Shakeshaft’s (1989) research was instrumental in identifying both external and internal barrier variables for Dulac’s study. These variables include existence of a male-dominated social network, sex discrimination, perceptions of and confidence in male and female leadership styles/roles, gender bias in the hiring and selection process, and personal barriers such as relocation and family. The design selection was made based on the research questions. A survey
method was used to collect data from participants. Survey research provides a description of trends, attitudes, or opinions of a population by studying a sample of that population.

Participants

For this study, participants assessed were administrators in public education in Illinois. The instrument was administered to male and female school administrators who aspire to the superintendency. Specifically, the instrument was completed by assistant principals, principals, central office administrators (directors, coordinators, etc.), and assistant superintendents. Since this was a survey research study, the sample size was 39 male and 46 female participants. The researcher did not foresee any vulnerable populations and the study did not target any specific ethnic groups.

Participants were eligible to complete this survey if they were current educational administrators who had aspirations for a future superintendent position. The sample for this survey was drawn from currently enrolled Ed.S. and Ed.D. candidates as well as administrators from districts in Illinois. Both online and paper versions of the study were available for respondents to complete. In addition, demographic data was collected for the purpose of describing the respondents participating in the study.
Procedure Design

For participants in the superintendent preparation program, the researcher visited a class session. After explaining the purpose of the research study, the researcher provided an Institutional Review Board’s (IRB) Informed Consent for Participants form (see Appendix C) and an introductory letter for the participant to keep with my contact information (see Appendix D). Then I handed out the survey (paper version) to the participants (see Appendix E). Each participant was also given a blank envelope to place the survey in once completed. This ensured anonymity of the participants. I left the room while the survey was being completed and the instructor collected the responses. The amount of time to complete the survey was about 15 minutes.

For participants who were administrators from local school districts, the survey was sent electronically. An introductory email (see Appendix F) was sent to the participants with an introductory letter (see Appendix G) explaining the purpose of the study. The email included the Institutional Review Board’s (IRB) Informed Consent for Participants (see Appendix C). Also included in the email was contact information for the researcher so that questions could be addressed promptly and easily. Included in the email was a link to the survey through Survey Monkey. Survey Monkey was used for the electronic version of this survey. Survey Monkey allows users to create surveys with the ability to obtain anonymous responses. If participants chose not to answer a question, they had the opportunity to skip. As participants
entered their responses digitally into the form, the data was automatically entered into a secure database provided by a Survey Monkey membership. Electronically sent surveys had a 10-day window for participants to respond. To those participants who had not responded after a week, a reminder email was sent.

As mentioned previously, demographic information was collected from the data for the purposes of describing the participants in the study. For the paper version of the survey, which was administered to the superintendent preparation candidates, anonymity was ensured by having participants place the completed survey in a blank envelope. Anonymity was ensured with the electronic versions of the survey using Survey Monkey, which allows for responses to be submitted without identifying information since email addresses and IP addresses are not collected. Data collected using the paper and electronic surveys was only kept through the completion of the study, at which time, paper copies were shredded and electronic versions were deleted.

Instrumentation

The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which administrators perceive barriers and the extent to which barriers perceived by women differ from barriers perceived by men as measured by the Aspiring Superintendents Perceived Barriers Questionnaire. My operational definition of the variable “barriers” is what administrators perceive as “getting in
their way” of moving up the ladder to the top position in educational administration. For this study, I used a descriptive research approach.

The instrument, the Questionnaire on Perceptions of Barriers and Strategies Impacting on Women Securing the Superintendency (see Appendix H), was developed and used by Dr. Betty Jane Dulac in her 1992 dissertation study. The Dulac questionnaire consisted of 18 demographic questions that addressed the personal and professional characteristics of women in the superintendency. The next two sections contained 30 statements, each utilizing a semantic differential scale to determine perceptions of barriers and strategies. The semantic differential scale was chosen by Dulac for its appropriateness in collecting information on perceptions and strategies. Scoring was completed by computing the numerical value for rating barriers from “1” representing not a major barrier to “5” representing a major barrier. For the purposes of this research, only the questions pertaining to barriers were included in the questionnaire.

Dulac (1992) established the reliability and validity of the instrument in her dissertation study:

When using Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient, a computed application of data determined a reliability coefficient of 0.96 for barriers and 0.86 for strategies. Content validity of the questionnaire was established by submitting it to two experts in the area of women in administration. Dr. Catherine Marshall and Dr. Jean Stockard confirmed their review of the instrument and made some suggestions for improving it. A Boston College statistician also analyzed the instrument format and provided suggestions to facilitate coding. Pilot study participants were also asked to critique the instrument and indicate ambiguities. The questionnaire was revised according to suggestions. (p. 74) It was then modified and used by Dr. Dee Anderson (1998), who used it in her study regarding perceptions of women superintendents.
To provide the sample with a more concise questionnaire, statements in the original questionnaire that did not relate to the hypotheses of this study were eliminated. These changes did not impact the reliability of validity previously tested by Dr. Dulac. The revised instrument was reviewed for clarity and content by conducting a pilot study of 50 women superintendents. The altered instrument consisted of 14 questions that addressed the personal and professional characteristics of women in superintendency-level positions and two sections of 21 statements each utilizing a Likert scale to determine perceptions of barriers and strategies of women to attaining the superintendency. (p.54)

Dr. Anderson obtained written permission from Dr. Dulac to revise the original instrument. The revised instrument was reviewed for clarity and content through a pilot study in which it was administered to 50 women superintendents. For the purposes of this study, Dr. Anderson’s version of the instrument (see Appendix I) was used without modification. Permission was obtained from both Dr. Dulac (see Appendix J) and Dr. Anderson (see Appendix K) to use the instrument for this research study.

For the purposes of this study, the instrument contained only questions regarding perceived barriers and was given to both male and female participants. Numerical values were assigned to a semantic differential scale for research purposes. This type of scale was used to measure respondents’ reactions to perceived barriers in terms of rankings on a bipolar scale. Respondents’ rankings were not values of context but rather important choices regarding attitudes towards perceived barriers. The survey (see Appendix E) also included a section to elicit demographic information.

Written directions were included prior to the perceived barrier Semantic Differential scale that read, “Please circle the number on the scale that best describes your perception of
possible barriers when attempting to secure the superintendency.” This is a slight change to the
directions that are included on Anderson’s instrument to account for both men and women
completing the survey.

Reliability

To assess scores from this instrument for reliability, I utilized internal consistency
reliability. Both Anderson and Dulac, to find reliability of the original instrument, used this same
type of reliability measure. In both of their studies, Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient was
applied and a computed application of data determined a reliability coefficient of 0.96 for
barriers. I also computed Cronbach’s Alpha and obtained a reliability coefficient of .94.

Data Treatment and Analysis

The data treatment and analysis were customized to meet the study conditions. The
survey data was collected, stored, and analyzed in a confidential manner as outlined in the IRB
guidelines. Reliability of the survey instrument was established prior to data analyses for the
study.

Numerical values assigned to barriers were used to create frequency tables. Barrier
statements addressed the variables identified by Dulac and Anderson in their studies. These
variables include existence of a male-dominated social network, sex discrimination, perceptions
of and confidence in male and female leadership styles/roles, gender bias in the hiring and
selection process, and personal barriers such as relocation and family. The instrument used a semantic differential scale with each participant ranking each statement from 1, being not a major barrier, to 5, being a major barrier. I looked for a relationship between gender and perceived barrier rankings.

In order to analyze statistical significance, I utilized the IBM SPSS software package. I also performed a Mann-Whitney U test to determine significant statistical differences between male and female responses.

Descriptive Statistics for Survey Data

Descriptive statistics were used to determine central tendency measures of the answers of the survey data. Descriptive statistics are mathematical techniques for organizing and summarizing a set of numerical data (e.g., counts and percentages; Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003). Frequency analysis is a descriptive statistical method that shows the number of occurrences of each response chosen by the respondents. For this study, the demographic data collected from the survey was displayed in tables with frequencies and percentages to show the distribution of responses. Frequency data from these tables was used to describe the aspiring superintendents from the participant sample.

In addition, the researcher displayed the survey data in tables with frequencies and percentages. This technique gave the research the ability to show the complete set of scores. In addition to frequencies by score, further investigation was pursued by grouping the higher (4 &
5) and lower (1 & 2) scores. The percentages of barrier statements receiving a rating of “4” or “5” were combined since these rankings are considered to indicate the highest barriers. This was done in order to determine the barriers considered highest by the greatest percentage of participants. The researcher also combined a ranking of “1” or “2” to indicate barriers considered the lowest. These analyses were done when the researcher looked at the data to determine which barriers were considered highest and lowest by respondents.

A non-parametric test, Mann-Whitney U, was used to determine significant statistical differences between male and female scores regarding perceived barriers. Data from these analyses was placed in table format for ease of displaying possible statistical differences. The p-value from this test was used to determine whether the null hypothesis was accepted or rejected for each barrier statement.

Summary

This chapter presented the research methodology for exploring the perceived barriers of men and women aspiring to the superintendency. The theoretical framework supported the methodology and the constructs outlined in the literature review and was guided by the research questions. A rationale for using a descriptive methodology for this study was also presented as were the participants, instrument used, and methods of data collection and analysis.
CHAPTER 4
DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

This chapter presents an analysis of the data collected from the research survey entitled Aspiring Superintendents Perceived Barriers Questionnaire (see Appendix E). This data analysis was used in answering the research questions set forth in Chapter 1. The findings are organized as follows: (a) demographic information of aspiring superintendents, (b) perceived barriers of aspiring superintendents, (c) differences in perceptions of barriers between men and women aspiring to the superintendency.

Reliability

I utilized internal consistency reliability to assess the instrument’s reliability. I obtained a Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient of 0.94 (Table 1). These findings were similar to the reliability coefficient (0.96) obtained by the author of the original instrument.
Table 1. *Cronbach’s Alpha*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha Based on Standardized Items</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
<td>.938</td>
<td>.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Demographic Information**

The respondents for this survey included 85 current school administrators. Both men (39) and women (46) made up the research sample for this survey. Frequency distributions were used to analyze the demographic information.

Table 2 shows that the majority of respondents, 46 or 54.12%, do not currently aspire to a superintendent position. All participant data was used, however, since participants enrolled in a superintendent preparation program and current administrators have the potential of becoming superintendents given the correct circumstances. One respondent chose not to answer the gender question, which explains the difference between male and female responses and the total number of responses. The majority of male participants do aspire to a superintendent position, 24 or 64.16%, while the majority of female participants, 67.39% (31) do not currently aspire to a superintendent position.
Table 2. Aspiring to a Superintendent Position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>63.16% (24)</td>
<td>32.61% (15)</td>
<td>45.88% (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>36.84% (14)</td>
<td>67.39% (31)</td>
<td>54.12% (46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 presents a summary of the highest degree earned by participants. All participants have at least a master’s degree and the majority of participants have a master’s degree as their highest degree earned. More women hold an Ed.S. degree, while more men than women hold either a Ph.D./Ed.D. or other degree. The Other option was included for participants to select if they held a degree that was not presented as an answer choice.

Table 3. Highest Degree Held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MS</td>
<td>57.89% (22)</td>
<td>67.39% (31)</td>
<td>63.53% (54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EdS</td>
<td>10.53% (4)</td>
<td>13.04% (6)</td>
<td>11.76% (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD/EdD</td>
<td>23.68% (9)</td>
<td>15.22% (7)</td>
<td>18.82% (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>4.35% (2)</td>
<td>5.88% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 represents the amount of administrative experience acquired by each participant. One respondent chose not to answer this question. The majority of respondents both male and female have between 6 and 10 years of administrative experience. A higher percentage of female participants have between 1 and 5 (30.43%) years and 6 and 10 (36.96%) years of experience.
However, more male participants had between 11 and 15 (24.32%) years and 16 and 20 (8.10%) years of experience than their female counterparts (21.74%, 6.52% respectively). Although equal numbers of men and women in this study have between 16 and 20 years of experience (three men and three women), men had a greater percentage at 8.10%. Slightly more women have 21+ years of experience at 4.35% (2) as opposed to one male participant (2.70%).

Table 4. Years of Administrative Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>29.73% (11)</td>
<td>30.43% (14)</td>
<td>30.12% (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>35.14% (13)</td>
<td>36.96% (17)</td>
<td>36.14% (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>24.32% (9)</td>
<td>21.74% (10)</td>
<td>22.89% (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>8.10% (3)</td>
<td>6.52% (3)</td>
<td>7.23% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>2.70% (1)</td>
<td>4.35% (2)</td>
<td>3.61% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows that the majority of participants are current central office administrators at 29.41% (25), with administrators who are principals close with 24.71% (21). This question allowed participants to mark multiple answer choices in case they are, for example, a central office administrator as well as a program director. The Other option was included for participants to select if their current position title held was not included as an option. More women were department heads, 23.91% (11), while more men were principals, 28.95% (11). Double the percentage of program directors were women (21.74%, 10), while double the percentage of assistant superintendents were men (13.16%, 5).
Table 5. *Position Title Held*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Title Held</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Principal</td>
<td>13.16% (5)</td>
<td>8.70% (4)</td>
<td>11.76% (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>28.95% (11)</td>
<td>21.74% (10)</td>
<td>24.71% (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Office</td>
<td>31.58% (12)</td>
<td>28.26% (13)</td>
<td>29.41% (25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Director</td>
<td>10.53% (4)</td>
<td>21.74% (10)</td>
<td>16.47% (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Superintendent</td>
<td>13.16% (5)</td>
<td>6.52% (3)</td>
<td>9.41% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Head</td>
<td>10.53% (4)</td>
<td>23.91% (11)</td>
<td>17.65% (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Director</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>19.57% (9)</td>
<td>14.12% (12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 displays the type of school in which these administrators work. Respondents were given the option to select more than one school setting type to accommodate for unit districts and K-8 districts. The Other option was included for participants to select if they worked in a central office setting or an entity that was not provided as an answer choice. The majority of respondents work in a high-school setting with 40.48% (34). A greater percentage of women worked in an elementary school (40.00%, 18) as compared with men (26.32%, 10). More men, however, work at the middle-school and high-school levels, with 26.32% (10) at the middle school and 42.11% (16) at the high school. One respondent chose not to answer this question and one respondent did not answer the gender question, so that explains the difference between the total number of participants and the total number of male and female responses.
Table 6. *School Type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>26.32% (10)</td>
<td>40.00% (18)</td>
<td>34.52% (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>26.32% (10)</td>
<td>15.56% (7)</td>
<td>20.24% (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>42.11% (16)</td>
<td>40.00% (18)</td>
<td>40.48% (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28.95% (11)</td>
<td>24.44% (11)</td>
<td>26.19% (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 indicates the student enrollment of the schools of the participants. Six female respondents chose not to answer this question as well as two male respondents. The majority of the participants work in schools with an enrollment of more than 1,000 students.

Table 7. *Enrollment by School*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Range</th>
<th>Male %</th>
<th>Female %</th>
<th>Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-200</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201-500</td>
<td>8.33% (3)</td>
<td>12.50% (5)</td>
<td>10.53% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>501-1000</td>
<td>27.78% (10)</td>
<td>20.00% (8)</td>
<td>26.68% (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 1000</td>
<td>44.44% (16)</td>
<td>45.00% (18)</td>
<td>44.74% (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19.44% (7)</td>
<td>22.50% (9)</td>
<td>21.05% (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>36</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 shows the majority of participants work in a district where the enrollment is between 1,000 and 4,999 students. Three respondents did not answer this question, so that explains the discrepancy between the total number of participants and the total number of responses.
Table 8. *Enrollment by District*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 1,000</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>2.27% (1)</td>
<td>4.88% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-4,999</td>
<td>47.37% (18)</td>
<td>65.91% (29)</td>
<td>57.32% (47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 5,000</td>
<td>39.47% (15)</td>
<td>31.82% (14)</td>
<td>35.37% (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.26% (2)</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
<td>2.44% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>44</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 displays the race/ethnic group with which each participant associates. The majority of participants identify as Caucasian/White with 85.71% (72) people. One respondent chose not to answer this question, so that explains the discrepancy between the total number of participants and the total responses.

Table 9. *Race/Ethnic Group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American/Black</td>
<td>2.63% (1)</td>
<td>2.17% (1)</td>
<td>2.38% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(non-Hispanic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American/Asian</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
<td>2.17% (1)</td>
<td>1.19% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian/White</td>
<td>78.95% (30)</td>
<td>91.30% (42)</td>
<td>85.71% (72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/Hispanic</td>
<td>18.42% (7)</td>
<td>4.53% (2)</td>
<td>10.71% (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native America</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10 shows the frequency and percentage of male and female participants. Of the 85 participants in this study, one respondent chose not to answer the gender question. The majority of respondents (54.1%) were female, while 44.7% were male.
Table 10. *Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Male</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Female</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>98.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 shows the breakdown of the ages of the participants. The majority of the participants are between the ages of 40 and 49 for both men and women (40.48%, n=34). However, a greater number of women were 50-59, (30.43%, n=14) compared to men 50-59 (21.05%, n=8), but a greater number of men were between the ages of 30 and 39, (28.95%, n=11) compared to women 30 and 39 (21.74%, n=10). One respondent chose not to answer this question.

Table 11. *Age*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
<td>4.35% (2)</td>
<td>2.38% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>28.95% (11)</td>
<td>21.74% (10)</td>
<td>25.00% (21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>47.37% (18)</td>
<td>34.78% (16)</td>
<td>40.48% (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>21.05% (8)</td>
<td>30.43% (14)</td>
<td>26.19% (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>2.63% (1)</td>
<td>8.70% (4)</td>
<td>5.95% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Respondents</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12 shows the marital status of the participants in this survey. The majority of the participants are married (85.54%). One female respondent skipped this question and one respondent chose not to answer this question.

Table 12. Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>5.26% (2)</td>
<td>6.67% (3)</td>
<td>6.07% (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>84.21% (32)</td>
<td>86.67% (39)</td>
<td>85.54% (71)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced or Separated</td>
<td>10.53% (4)</td>
<td>6.67% (3)</td>
<td>8.43% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13 displays the number of children that each participant has. The majority of the participants have two children (40.48%). More men (36.84%) had three children than women (21.74%), but more women (15.22%) had four or more children than men (7.89%). One respondent chose not to answer this question.

Table 13. Number of Children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.79% (6)</td>
<td>15.22% (7)</td>
<td>15.48 % (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>0.00% (0)</td>
<td>3.57% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>31.58% (12)</td>
<td>47.83% (22)</td>
<td>40.48% (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>36.84% (14)</td>
<td>21.74% (10)</td>
<td>28.57% (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 or more</td>
<td>7.89% (3)</td>
<td>15.22% (7)</td>
<td>11.90% (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Respondents</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aspiring Superintendents
Based on the demographic data collected, an aspiring superintendent in the sample for this study is female, Caucasian/White, and between the ages of 40 and 49. The administrator is married and has at least two children. This person has at least a master’s degree and holds either a central office or principal position with between 6 and 10 years of administrative experience. The school in which he/she works has at least 1,000 students and is most likely a high school in a district with between 1,000 and 4,999 students.

Research Questions Findings

This study was designed to answer the following research questions:

1) To what extent do aspiring superintendents perceive barriers in their upward mobility toward the position of superintendent as measured by the Aspiring Superintendents Perceived Barriers Questionnaire?

2) To what extent do the barriers in upward mobility toward the position of superintendent that women perceive differ from the barriers that men perceive as measured by the Aspiring Superintendents Perceived Barriers Questionnaire?

_Ho: There are no barriers in upward mobility toward the position of superintendent that women perceive that differ from the barriers that men perceive as measured by the Aspiring Superintendents Perceived Barriers Questionnaire._
Ha: There are barriers in upward mobility toward the position of superintendent that women perceive that differ from the barriers that men perceive as measured by the Aspiring Superintendents Perceived Barriers Questionnaire.
Research Question One Findings

To what extent do aspiring superintendents perceive barriers in their upward mobility toward the position of superintendent as measured by the Aspiring Superintendents Perceived Barriers Questionnaire?

In order to answer this research question, I analyzed the frequency of answers as a whole for each barrier statement. This was done through the use of frequency tables for each barrier. Lastly I analyzed the number of respondents answering, the frequency, and the median value for each barrier statement.

In the questionnaire, respondents were asked to rate barriers perceived. The questionnaire included 21 barrier statements. The respondents were asked to rate perceived barriers using a semantic differential scale from number “1” representing not a major barrier to number “5” representing a major barrier. Numerical values (1, 2, 3, 4, 5) were given to each possible ranking for the barrier statements for future purposes. Rankings were not values of context.

Frequency tables were also created to show the number of participants that chose each ranking (1-5) as well as the percentage (Tables 14-34). These tables indicate the frequency of the population sampled and are not broken down by gender.
Table 14. **Q13. Conflicting Demands on Career and Family**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – being not a major barrier</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – being a major barrier</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The greatest number of participants (25) ranked this perceived barrier as a ‘4’ on the semantic differential scale while 11 participants chose both a ranking of ‘2’ and ‘5’. Five participants chose not to answer this question.

Table 15. **Q14. Lack of Ability to Relocate as a Result of Personal Commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – being not a major barrier</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – being a major barrier</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The greatest number (23) of participants ranked this perceived barrier as a ‘4’ while the least number (11) ranked the barrier as a ‘5’. Five participants skipped this question.

Table 16. *Q15. The Belief That Women Do Not Make Good Administrators*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – being not a major barrier</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – being a major barrier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, almost 70% (59) of the participants that answered this question chose ‘1’.

The least number of participants (1) chose ‘5’. Five participants skipped this question.
Table 17. *Q16. Inappropriate Career Path Experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – being not a major barrier</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>63.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – being a major barrier</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing System: 6

Total: 85

The greatest number of participants (39) ranked this perceived barrier as a ‘1’. The least number of participants (2) ranked this perceived barrier as a ‘5’. Five participants chose not to answer this question.

Table 18. *Q17. Childhood Socialization to “Proper” Roles for Men and Women*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – being not a major barrier</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – being a major barrier</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing System: 5

Total: 85

100.0
Participants for this question did not choose ‘4’ or ‘5’ as a ranking. The greatest number of participants (51) chose ‘1’ while only 13 participants chose ‘2’. Five participants chose not to answer this question.

Table 19. Q18. The Predominance of Male Candidates for Administrative Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid 1 – being not a major barrier</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>75.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>93.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – being a major barrier</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this perceived barrier statement, the greatest number of participants (27) chose ‘1’ while only five participants chose ‘5’ as a ranking. Six participants chose to skip this question.

Table 20. Q19. Lack of a Mentor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid 1 – being not a major barrier</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>47.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – being a major barrier</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Almost 30% of participants ranked this perceived barrier as a ‘1’ while only 6% ranked it as a ‘5’. Five participants chose not to answer this question.

Table 21. Q20. Existence of the “Buddy System” in Which Men Refer Other Men to Jobs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – being not a major barrier</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – being a major barrier</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The greatest number of participants (24) ranked this barrier as a ‘1’ and the least number (10) ranked it as a ‘5’. Five participants chose not to answer this question.

Table 22. Q21. Doubt by Those in a Hiring Position of Women’s Long-Term Career Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – being not a major barrier</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – being a major barrier</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thirty-six participants ranked this barrier as a ‘1’ while four ranked it as a ‘4’. Seven participants skipped this question.

Table 23. **Q22. Lack of Self-Confidence in Ability to Succeed in Top Jobs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – being not a major barrier</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – being a major barrier</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the participants ranked this perceived barrier statement as a ‘5’. The greatest number (40) ranked it as a ‘1’ while the least number (7) ranked it as a ‘5’. Six participants chose not to answer this question.

Table 24. **Q23. Gender Bias in the Screening and Selection Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – being not a major barrier</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>93.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – being a major barrier</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the participants ranked this perceived barrier statement as a ‘5’. The greatest number (40) ranked it as a ‘1’ while the least number (7) ranked it as a ‘5’. Six participants chose not to answer this question.
Twenty-eight participants ranked this statement as a ‘1’ while the least number (5) ranked it as a ‘5’. Five participants chose not to answer this question.

Table 25. *Q24. Exclusion from Informal Socialization Process of “Good Old Boy Network”*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – being not a major barrier</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents ranked this perceived barrier evenly among the five ratings with ‘1’ receiving the most (22) and ‘4’ receiving the least (11). Five participants chose not to answer this question.

Table 26. *Q25. Lack of Acceptance by Male Administrators and Staff*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 – being not a major barrier</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – being a major barrier</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Again, most respondents (36) chose ‘1’ as the ranking for this barrier while the least number (4) chose ‘5’. Six participants skipped this question entirely.

Table 27. Q26. Lack of Acceptance by Female Administrators and Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>1 – being not a major barrier</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 – being a major barrier</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing System | 5 | 5.9 |
Total           | 85 | 100.0 |

The greatest number of participants (37) for this question chose ‘1’ as the ranking while the least number (3) chose ‘5’. Five participants skipped this question.

Table 28. Q27. Lack of Political “Know How”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>1 – being not a major barrier</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 – being a major barrier</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Missing System | 5 | 5.9 |
Total           | 85 | 100.0 |
Twenty-seven respondents ranked this perceived barrier in the middle with a ranking of ‘3’ while the least number (4) ranked it as a ‘5’. Five participants chose not to answer this question.

Table 29. Q28. Lack of Motivation to Compete for Top Jobs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – being not a major barrier</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>97.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – being a major barrier</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As has been the case with other questions, most participants (37) ranked this statement as a ‘1’ while the least (2) ranked it as a ‘5’. Again, five participants chose not to answer this question.
Table 30. Q29. The Belief That Women Must be Better Qualified Than Men in Order to Attain Top-Level Administrative Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – being not a major barrier</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – being a major barrier</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirty-seven participants ranked this perceived barrier as a ‘1’ while three participants ranked it as a ‘5’. Six participants skipped this question.

Table 31. Q30. Lack of Strong Women’s Network Similar to the “Good Old Boy Network”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – being not a major barrier</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>89.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – being a major barrier</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing System</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The greatest number of participants (31) chose ‘1’ as a ranking for this barrier while the least number (8) chose ‘5’. Six participants did not answer this question.
Table 32. Q31. Covert Sex Discrimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – being not a major barrier</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>65.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>93.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – being a major barrier</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The greatest number of respondents (30) ranked this barrier as a ‘1’ and the least number (5) ranked it as a ‘5’. Seven participants chose not to answer this question entirely.

Table 33. Q32. Overt Sex Discrimination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – being not a major barrier</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>74.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>97.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – being a major barrier</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The largest number of participants (40) ranked this barrier as a ‘1’ while the smallest number (2) ranked it as a ‘5’. Again, seven people chose not to answer this question.
Table 34. Q33. Potential Colleagues’ Insubordination in Working for a Female Boss

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>1 – being not a major barrier</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 – being a major barrier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>System</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the last barrier statement, the greatest number of respondents (45) chose ‘1’ as a ranking while the least number (1) chose ‘5’ as a ranking. Five respondents chose not to answer this question.

Barrier Frequency Analysis

When analyzing the frequency of answers for each barrier statement, I found that only two of the barrier statements were considered high by the most respondents. Twenty-five respondents (29.4%) indicated the barrier statement, conflicting demands on career and family, as a ‘4’ on the semantic differential scale. When combined with respondents who chose ‘5’ on the scale for this statement, 36 respondents (42.3%) indicated this was a high perceived barrier.

Similarly, 23 respondents (27.1%) chose ‘4’ for the perceived barrier statement, lack of ability to relocate as a result of personal commitment. When combined with respondents who...
chose ‘5’ on the scale for this statement, 34 respondents (40.0%) indicated this was a high perceived barrier. The other barrier statements had frequencies which indicated that respondents did not perceive them as barriers.

**Median Value Analysis**

The number of respondents answering, frequency of ratings, and median for each barrier statement is reported in Table 35. The median values generated were either 1, 2, or 3.

Table 35 shows that at least five respondents chose not to rank the perceived barriers statements. The median value for all participants was either 1, 2, or 3. This indicates that as a whole, the group of participants did not perceive any of the barrier statements as major barriers when analyzing the median values.

In summary, the findings for Research Question One indicate that most respondents perceive conflicting demands on career and family as well as lack of ability to relocate as a result of personal commitment as high barriers when analyzing frequencies. Lastly when analyzing the median values for each barrier statement, participants did not perceive any of the barriers as major.
Table 35. *Barrier Frequency with Median*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier Statements</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>1 Not Major Barrier</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 Major Barrier</th>
<th>Md</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting demands of career and family</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
<td>13.75%</td>
<td>23.75%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>13.75%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of ability to relocate as a result of personal commitment</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>28.75%</td>
<td>13.75%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The belief that women do not make good administrators</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>73.73%</td>
<td>11.25%</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate career path experiences</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>49.37%</td>
<td>13.92%</td>
<td>18.99%</td>
<td>15.19%</td>
<td>2.53%</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood socialization to “proper” roles for men and women</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>63.75%</td>
<td>16.25%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The predominance of male candidates for administrative positions</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>34.18%</td>
<td>21.52%</td>
<td>20.25%</td>
<td>17.72%</td>
<td>6.33%</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of mentor</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>16.25%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>21.25%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of the “buddy system” in which men refer other men to jobs</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubt by those in a hiring position of women’s long term career commitment</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
<td>19.23%</td>
<td>5.13%</td>
<td>6.41%</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of self confidence in ability to succeed in top jobs</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>50.63%</td>
<td>17.72%</td>
<td>22.78%</td>
<td>8.86%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender bias in the screening and selection process</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35.00%</td>
<td>28.75%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion from informal socialization process of “Good Old Boy Network”</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>27.50%</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>23.75%</td>
<td>13.75%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of acceptance by male administrators and staff</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>45.57%</td>
<td>17.72%</td>
<td>18.99%</td>
<td>12.66%</td>
<td>5.06%</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of acceptance by female administrators and staff</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>46.25%</td>
<td>21.25%</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
<td>11.25%</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of political “know how”</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>27.50%</td>
<td>16.25%</td>
<td>33.75%</td>
<td>17.50%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of motivation to compete for top jobs</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>46.25%</td>
<td>21.25%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>11.25%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The belief that women must be better qualified than men in order to attain top level administrative positions</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>46.84%</td>
<td>15.19%</td>
<td>21.52%</td>
<td>12.66%</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of strong women’s network similar to the “Good Old Boy Network”</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>39.24%</td>
<td>15.19%</td>
<td>16.46%</td>
<td>18.99%</td>
<td>10.13%</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covert sex discrimination</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
<td>26.92%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>11.54%</td>
<td>6.41%</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overt sex discrimination</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>51.28%</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>6.41%</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential colleagues’ insubordination in working for a female boss</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>56.25%</td>
<td>15.00%</td>
<td>22.50%</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>1.25%</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=Not a Major Barrier      5=Major Barrier
Research Question Two Findings

To what extent do the barriers in upward mobility toward the position of superintendent that women perceive differ from the barriers that men perceive as measured by the Aspiring Superintendents Perceived Barriers Questionnaire? In order to answer this research question, I analyzed the frequency of answers by gender. This included looking at female and male respondents who chose a 4 or 5 (high barriers) and a 1 or 2 (low barriers). Next I compared barriers considered high and low between female and male respondents. Lastly I determined if there was a significant statistical difference between male and female responses using the Mann Whitney-U test.

Female and Male Barrier Frequency Analysis

I analyzed the frequency of barriers perceived by women and men. The frequency of all barriers encountered by female and male administrators who completed the survey is reported in Appendix L and Appendix M, respectively. A summary of barriers considered major by women and men is presented in Table 36. A rating of “4” and “5” on this scale were considered high barriers.
Table 36. Frequency of Major (High) Barriers by Female and Male Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 Major Barrier</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting demands of career and family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>36.36%, n=16</td>
<td>13.64%, n=6</td>
<td>50.00%, n=22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>25.00%, n=9</td>
<td>13.89%, n=5</td>
<td>38.89%, n=14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of ability to relocate as a result of a personal commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>27.27%, n=12</td>
<td>11.36%, n=5</td>
<td>38.63%, n=17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>30.56%, n=11</td>
<td>16.67%, n=6</td>
<td>47.23%, n=17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The belief that women do not make good administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>11.36%, n=5</td>
<td>0.00%, n=0</td>
<td>11.36%, n=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>0.00%, n=0</td>
<td>2.78%, n=1</td>
<td>2.78%, n=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate career path experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>9.30%, n=4</td>
<td>2.33%, n=1</td>
<td>11.36%, n=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>22.22%, n=8</td>
<td>2.78%, n=1</td>
<td>25.00%, n=9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood socialization to “proper” roles for men and women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>0.00%, n=0</td>
<td>0.00%, n=0</td>
<td>0.00%, n=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>0.00%, n=0</td>
<td>0.00%, n=0</td>
<td>0.00%, n=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The predominance of male candidates for administrative positions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>27.27%, n=12</td>
<td>6.82%, n=3</td>
<td>34.09%, n=15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>5.71%, n=2</td>
<td>5.71%, n=2</td>
<td>11.42%, n=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of mentor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>20.45%, n=9</td>
<td>4.55%, n=2</td>
<td>25.00%, n=11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>22.22%, n=8</td>
<td>8.33%, n=3</td>
<td>30.55%, n=11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of the “buddy system” in which men refer other men to jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>20.45%, n=9</td>
<td>20.45%, n=9</td>
<td>40.9%, n=18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubt by those in a hiring position of women’s long term career commitment</td>
<td>19.44%</td>
<td>6.82%</td>
<td>2.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=7</td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>n=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of self confidence in ability to succeed in top jobs</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>6.98%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=1</td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>n=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=1</td>
<td>n=4</td>
<td>n=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender bias in the screening and selection process</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td>20.45%</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=12</td>
<td>n=9</td>
<td>n=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>2.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>n=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion from informal socialization process of “Good Old Boy Network”</td>
<td>20.45%</td>
<td>20.45%</td>
<td>22.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=9</td>
<td>n=9</td>
<td>n=10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>n=2</td>
<td>n=6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of acceptance by male administrators and staff</td>
<td>20.45%</td>
<td>20.45%</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=9</td>
<td>n=9</td>
<td>n=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.86%</td>
<td>2.86%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=1</td>
<td>n=1</td>
<td>n=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of acceptance by female administrators and staff</td>
<td>13.64%</td>
<td>13.64%</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=6</td>
<td>n=6</td>
<td>n=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>n=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of political “know how”</td>
<td>20.45%</td>
<td>20.45%</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=9</td>
<td>n=9</td>
<td>n=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.89%</td>
<td>13.89%</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>n=5</td>
<td>n=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of motivation to compete for top jobs</td>
<td>13.64%</td>
<td>13.64%</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=6</td>
<td>n=6</td>
<td>n=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>2.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>n=3</td>
<td>n=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The belief that women must be better qualified than men in order to attain top level administrative positions</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>20.93%, n=9</td>
<td>6.98%, n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>2.78%, n=1</td>
<td>0.00%, n=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of strong women’s network similar to the “Good Old Boys” network</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>23.26%, n=10</td>
<td>18.60%, n=8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>13.89%, n=5</td>
<td>0.00%, n=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covert sex discrimination</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>16.28%, n=7</td>
<td>9.30%, n=4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>5.71%, n=2</td>
<td>2.86%, n=1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overt sex discrimination</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>9.30%, n=4</td>
<td>4.65%, n=2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>2.86%, n=1</td>
<td>0.00%, n=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential colleagues’ insubordination in working for a female boss</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>6.82%, n=3</td>
<td>0.00%, n=0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>2.78%, n=1</td>
<td>2.78%, n=1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f=Female, m=Male

As is displayed in Table 36, the most frequent major barrier perceived by female respondents was “exclusion from informal socialization process of Good Old Boy Network,” with 22.73% (10) of women indicating it was a major barrier. This table also shows that 5 out of 21 barriers are perceived as a major barrier (a rating of “5”) by at least 10% of women respondents. The barriers are as follows: exclusion from informal socializations process of “Good Old Boy Network” (22.73%), existence of the “buddy system” in which men refer other men to jobs (20.45%), lack of strong women’s network similar to the “Good Old Boys” network
(18.60%), conflicting demands of career and family (13.64%), and lack of ability to relocate as a result of personal commitment (11.36%).

When combining a rating of “4” and a rating of “5” to find the barriers that are considered the highest barriers to female respondents, Table 36 indicates that 12 out of 21 barriers are considered the highest barriers by at least 25% of women. This constitutes over half of the barriers that were presented for this study. These barriers are as follows: conflicting demands of career and family (50.00%), exclusion from informal socialization process of “Good Old Boy Network” (43.18%), lack of strong women’s network similar to the “Good Old Boy Network” (41.86%), existence of the “buddy system” in which men refer other men to jobs (40.90%), lack of ability to relocate as a result of personal commitment (38.63%), gender bias in the screening and selection process (36.36%), predominance of male candidates for administrative positions (34.09%), lack of acceptance by male administrators and staff (29.54%), the belief that women must be better qualified than men in order to attain top-level administrative positions (27.91%), covert sex discrimination (25.58%), lack of mentor (25.00%), and lack of political know how (25.00%).

Table 36 shows the most chosen barriers perceived by male respondents were “lack of ability to relocate as a result of personal commitment” and “exclusion from informal socialization process of Good Old Boy Network” with 16.67% of male respondents indicating those were major barriers.
When combining a rating of “4” and a rating of “5” to find the barriers that are considered the highest to male respondents, Table 36 indicates that 4 out of 21 barriers are considered high barriers by at least 25% of men. These barriers are as follows: lack of ability to relocate as a result of personal commitment (47.23%), conflicting demands of career and family (38.89%), lack of mentor (30.55%), and inappropriate career paths (25.00%).

A summary of barriers considered not major by women and men is presented in Table 37. Ratings of “1” and “2” on this scale were considered low barriers.

Table 37. Frequency of Low (Not Major) Barriers by Female and Male Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>1 Low Barrier</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting demands of career and family</td>
<td>f 15.91%, n=7</td>
<td>9.09%, n=4</td>
<td>25.00%, n=11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m 19.44%, n=7</td>
<td>19.44%, n=7</td>
<td>38.88%, n=14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of ability to relocate as a result of a personal commitment</td>
<td>f 23.73%, n=10</td>
<td>25.00%, n=11</td>
<td>47.73%, n=21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m 11.11%, n=4</td>
<td>13.89%, n=5</td>
<td>25.00%, n=9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The belief that women do not make good administrators</td>
<td>f 65.91%, n=29</td>
<td>13.64%, n=6</td>
<td>79.55%, n=35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m 83.33%, n=30</td>
<td>8.33%, n=3</td>
<td>91.66%, n=33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate career path experiences</td>
<td>f 58.14%, n=25</td>
<td>6.98%, n=3</td>
<td>65.12%, n=28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m 38.89%, n=14</td>
<td>22.22%, n=8</td>
<td>61.11%, n=22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood socialization to “proper” roles for men and women</td>
<td>f 65.91%, n=29</td>
<td>11.36%, n=5</td>
<td>77.27%, n=34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The predominance of male candidates for administrative positions</td>
<td>61.11%, 22</td>
<td>22.22%, 8</td>
<td>83.33%, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of mentor</td>
<td>51.43%, 18</td>
<td>20.00%, 7</td>
<td>71.43%, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of the “buddy system” in which men refer other men to jobs</td>
<td>29.56%, 13</td>
<td>13.64%, 6</td>
<td>43.19%, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.33%, 12</td>
<td>19.44%, 7</td>
<td>52.77%, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubt by those in a hiring position of women’s long term career commitment</td>
<td>47.22%, 17</td>
<td>20.45%, 9</td>
<td>36.36%, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.76%, 21</td>
<td>26.47%, 9</td>
<td>88.23%, 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of self confidence in ability to succeed in top jobs</td>
<td>51.16%, 22</td>
<td>11.63%, 5</td>
<td>62.79%, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50.00%, 18</td>
<td>25.00%, 9</td>
<td>75.00%, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender bias in the screening and selection process</td>
<td>20.45%, 9</td>
<td>29.55%, 13</td>
<td>50.00%, 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.78%, 19</td>
<td>27.78%, 10</td>
<td>80.56%, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion from informal socialization process of “Good Old Boy Network”</td>
<td>15.91%, 7</td>
<td>18.18%, 8</td>
<td>34.09%, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41.67%, 15</td>
<td>11.11%, 4</td>
<td>52.78%, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of acceptance by male administrators and staff</td>
<td>31.82%, 14</td>
<td>15.91%, 10</td>
<td>47.73%, 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.86%, 22</td>
<td>20.00%, 7</td>
<td>82.86%, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of acceptance by female administrators and staff</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>34.09%, n=15</td>
<td>22.73%, n=10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>61.11%, n=22</td>
<td>19.44%, n=7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of political “know how”</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>22.73%, n=10</td>
<td>18.18%, n=8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>33.33%, n=12</td>
<td>13.89%, n=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of motivation to compete for top jobs</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>47.73%, n=21</td>
<td>22.73%, n=10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>44.44%, n=16</td>
<td>19.44%, n=7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The belief that women must be better qualified than men in order to attain top-level administrative positions</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>30.23%, n=13</td>
<td>13.95%, n=6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>66.67%, n=24</td>
<td>16.67%, n=6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of strong women’s network similar to the “Good Old Boys” network</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>18.60%, n=8</td>
<td>20.93%, n=9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>63.89%, n=23</td>
<td>8.33%, n=3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covert sex discrimination</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>30.23%, n=13</td>
<td>25.58%, n=11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>48.57%, n=17</td>
<td>28.57%, n=10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overt sex discrimination</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>46.51%, n=20</td>
<td>23.26%, n=10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>57.14%, n=20</td>
<td>22.86%, n=8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential colleagues’ insubordination in working for a female boss</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>45.45%, n=20</td>
<td>20.45%, n=9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m</td>
<td>69.44%, n=25</td>
<td>8.33%, n=3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f=Female, m=Male
Table 37 indicates that the least perceived barriers by women were “belief that women do not make good administrators” and “childhood socialization to proper roles for men and women,” with 65.91% of women agreeing that neither was a major barrier. As indicated on Table 37, when combining a rating of “1” and a rating of “2” to find the barriers that are considered the lowest to female respondents, I found 11 barriers that at least 50% of women indicated as low. This constitutes over half of the barriers that were presented for this study. These barriers are as follows: the belief that women do not make good administrators (79.55%), childhood socialization to “proper” roles for men and women (77.27%), lack of motivation to compete for top jobs (70.46%), overt sex discrimination (69.77%), potential colleagues’ insubordination in working for a female boss (65.90%), inappropriate career paths (65.12%), lack of self-confidence in ability to succeed in top jobs (62.79%), lack of acceptance by female administrators and staff (56.82%), covert sex discrimination (55.81%), doubt by those in a hiring position of women’s long-term career commitment (54.54%), and gender bias in the screening and selection process (50.00%).

According to Table 37, the least perceived barrier by men was “belief that women do not make good administrators,” with 83.33% of men indicating that was not a major barrier. This table also indicates, when combining a rating of “1” and a rating of “2” to find the barriers that are considered the lowest to male respondents, I found 18 barriers that at least 50% of men indicated as low. This constitutes all but three of the barriers that were presented for this study. These barriers are as follows: the belief that women do not make good administrators (91.66%),
doubt by those in a hiring position of women’s long-term career commitment (88.22%), the belief that women must be better qualified than men in order to attain top-level administrative positions (83.34%), childhood socialization to “proper” roles for men and women (83.33%), lack of acceptance by male administrators and staff (82.88%), gender bias in the screening and selection process (80.56%), lack of acceptance by female administrators and staff (80.55%), overt sex discrimination (80.00%), potential colleagues’ insubordination in working for a female boss (77.77%), covert sex discrimination (77.14%), lack of self-confidence in ability to succeed in top jobs (75.00%), lack of strong women’s network similar to the “Good Old Boys” network (72.22%), the predominance of male candidates for administrative jobs (71.42%), existence of the “buddy system” in which men refer other men to jobs (63.89%), inappropriate career paths (61.11%), exclusion from the informal socialization process of “Good Old Boy Network” (52.78%), and lack of mentor (52.77%).

Men were almost equally divided on whether or not conflicting demands of career and family was a major barrier. The percentage of male respondents that rated this barrier as major (38.89%) was equal to the percentage that rated this barrier as not major (38.88%).

In summary, female respondents indicated that there were perceived barriers in their upward mobility toward the position of superintendent. These barriers included personal reasons such as family commitment and an inability to relocate. In addition, female respondents perceived barriers involving bias and discrimination in the selection process as major. Furthermore, many female respondents indicated that being excluded from socialization
networks in which men often refer other men for positions was a perceived barrier as was lack of a mentor.

The perceived barriers that female respondents did not feel were major included barriers that involved lack of self-confidence, lack of acceptance by other female staff, or lack of motivation to compete for top jobs. Female respondents also indicated that being socialized to proper gender roles as children was not a major perceived barrier nor overt and covert sexual discrimination.

Male respondents did indicate that there were perceived barriers in their upward mobility toward the position of superintendent. These barriers included personal reasons such as family commitment and inability to relocate. Male respondent also perceived inappropriate career paths as a barrier. Furthermore, male participants identified lack of a mentor as a perceived barrier to their upward mobility.

Men perceived all but three of the barrier statements as low in their upward mobility toward the superintendency. The barriers that most men felt were the lowest included barrier statements that focused on a female candidate’s ability to lead. Male respondents also indicated that lack of acceptance by male and female staff was a low perceived barrier. Lastly men specified that being socialized to proper gender roles as children was also a low perceived barrier.
Gender Barrier Frequency Analysis Comparison

When comparing how the frequency of barriers perceived by women differ from the frequency of barriers perceived by men for this study, I first looked at the findings for major barriers (a rating of “5”). Table 36 indicates that for women respondents, this was the barrier statement, exclusion from informal socialization process of “Good Old Boy Network.” In this survey, 22.73% (n=10) of the female respondents indicated this was a major barrier. Male respondents indicated this was a major barrier (16.67%, n=6) as well but also indicated “lack of ability to relocate as a result of personal commitment” as a major barrier (16.67%, n=6).

Although both men and women indicated that “exclusion from informal socialization process of “Good Old Boy Network” was a major barrier, more women than men indicated this was a major barrier (Table 38).

Table 38. Greatest Major Barrier(s) Perceived by Women and Men by Percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exclusion from informal socialization process of “Good Old Boy Network”</td>
<td>Exclusion from informal socialization process of “Good Old Boy Network”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(22.73%, n=10)</td>
<td>(16.67%, n=6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of ability to relocate as a result of personal commitment (16.67%, n=6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When combining ratings of “4” and “5” to find the barriers that are considered the highest to respondents, I found similarities and differences between men and women. Table 36 indicates that women respondents indicated 12/21 barriers as high while men only indicated 4/21 barriers as high. Three of those barriers were considered high barriers by both men and women:
conflicting demands of career and family, lack of ability to relocate as a result of personal commitment, and lack of mentor. Although both men and women indicated that “conflicting demands of career and family” was a high barrier, half (n=22) of the female respondents indicated this was high while only 38.89% (n=14) of males indicated it was high. Men also indicated that “inappropriate career paths” was a high barrier while women did not indicate this was a high barrier at all.

Table 39 displays that more men (47.23%, n=17) indicated that the “lack of ability to relocate as a result of personal commitment” was a high barrier, compared to only 38.63% (n=17) of women indicating it was a high barrier. “Lack of mentor” was indicated as high by 30.55%, (n=11) of men but only 25.00%, (n=11) of women. Lastly women had nine barriers that were indicated as high which were not indicated by men as high. These barriers are as follows: exclusion from informal socialization process of “Good Old Boy Network” (43.18%), lack of strong women’s network similar to the “Good Old Boy Network” (41.86%), existence of the “buddy system” in which men refer other men to jobs (40.90%), gender bias in the screening and selection process (36.36%), predominance of male candidates for administrative positions (34.09%), lack of acceptance by male administrators and staff (29.54%), the belief that women must be better qualified than men in order to attain top-level administrative positions (27.91%), covert sex discrimination (25.58%), and lack of political know-how (25.00%).
Table 39. *Barriers Perceived as High (Major Barriers) by at Least 25% of Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Conflicting demands of career and family (50.00%, n=22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of ability to relocate as a result of personal commitment (38.63%, n=17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Predominance of male candidates for administrative positions (34.09%, n=15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of mentor (25.00%, n=11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existence of the “buddy system: in which men refer other men to jobs (40.90%, n=18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender bias in the screening and selection process (36.36%, n=16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exclusion from informal socialization process of “Good Old Boy Network” (43.18%, n=19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of acceptance by male administrators and staff (29.54%, n=13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of political know how (25.00%, n=11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The belief that women must be better qualified then men in order to attain top level administrative positions (27.91%, n=12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of strong women’s network similar to the “Good Old Boy Network” (41.86%, n=18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Covert sex discrimination (25.58%, n=11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Conflicting demands of career and family (38.89%, n=14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of ability to relocate as a result of personal commitment (47.23%, n=17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inappropriate career paths (25.00%, n=9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of mentor (30.55%, n=11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When comparing barriers that men and women perceived to be low (rating of “1” or “2”), men perceived more barriers as low than women. At least 50% of the female respondents perceived 11 barriers as low while at least 50% of male participants perceived 18 barriers as low. This comparison is shown in Table 40.
Table 40. *Barriers Perceived as Low (Not Major Barriers) by at Least 50% of Respondents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The belief that women do not make good administrators (79.55%, n=35)</td>
<td>The belief that women do not make good administrators (91.66%, n=33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate career path experiences (65.12%, n=28)</td>
<td>Inappropriate career path experiences (61.11%, n=22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood socialization to “proper roles” for men and women (77.27%, n=34)</td>
<td>Childhood socialization to “proper roles” for men and women (83.33%, n=30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubt by those in a hiring position of women’s long-term career commitment (54.54%, n=24)</td>
<td>The predominance of male candidates for administrative positions (71.43%, n=25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of self-confidence in ability to succeed in top jobs (62.79%, n=27)</td>
<td>Lack of mentor (52.77%, n=19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender bias in screening and selection process (50.00%, n=22)</td>
<td>Existence of the “buddy system” in which men refer other men to jobs (63.89%, n=23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of acceptance by female administrators and staff (56.82%, n=25)</td>
<td>Doubt by those in a hiring position of women’s long-term career commitment (88.22%, n=30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of motivation to keep top jobs (70.46%, n=31)</td>
<td>Lack of self-confidence in ability to succeed in top jobs (75.00%, n=27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covert sex discrimination (55.81%, n=24)</td>
<td>Gender bias in screening and selection process (80.56%, n=29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overt sex discrimination (69.77%, n=30)</td>
<td>Exclusion from informal socialization process of “Good Old Boy Network” (52.78%, n=19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential colleagues’ insubordination in working for a female boss (65.90%, n=29)</td>
<td>Lack of acceptance by male administrators and staff (82.88%, n=29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of acceptance by female administrators and staff (80.55%, n=29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of motivation to keep top jobs (63.88%, n=23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The belief that women must be better qualified than men in order to attain top-level administrative positions (83.34%, n=30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of strong women’s network similar to the “Good Old Boys” network (72.22%, n=26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Covert sex discrimination (77.14%, n=27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overt sex discrimination (80.00%, n=28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Potential colleagues’ insubordination in working for a female boss (77.77%, n=28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summary, both male and female respondents perceived barriers to their upward mobility toward the superintendency when analyzing frequencies. When looking at perceived barriers considered major (rating of “5”), both male and female respondents chose exclusion from socialization networks as the greatest perceived barrier. Both male and female participants also perceived barriers involving conflicting demands of career and family as well as an inability to relocate as major barriers. When looking at the barriers considered high (ratings of “4” and “5”), both men and women indicated that a lack of a mentor was also a barrier. Men perceived more barriers as low (ratings of “1” and “2”) than did their female counterparts. The male participants also perceived all barriers perceived by the female participants as low.

Research Question Two Statistical Analysis

Appendix N includes the complete statistical analysis of the survey data. This analysis includes the number of participants answering each question, the number choosing to skip each question, the median, standard deviation, skewness, and standard error of skewness. Of interest is that one participant chose not to answer the gender question. Also, an average of six participants per question chose not to answer. When analyzing the median for each question, more participants chose ‘2’ on the semantic differential scale than any other ranking.

Appendix N includes group statistics for each of the perceived barrier statements. The analysis is broken down by number of participants and by gender based on who answered each question, as well as the mean, standard deviation, and standard error mean. Of interest is that
women had a higher mean in 18/21 questions. The three questions where men had a higher mean include lack of ability to relocate as a result of personal commitment, inappropriate career path experiences, and lack of motivation to compete for top jobs.

Mann-Whitney U Test Analysis

The Mann-Whitney U test is a non-parametric test that is used to compare two population means. It is also used to test whether two population means are equal. When looking at the Mann-Whitney U test statistics, Appendix O, I analyzed the p-value for significance. I identified ten perceived barriers with statistically significant difference (p < .05 and p < .001) as indicated in Table 41. Therefore, I rejected the null hypothesis for Research Question Two for those ten perceived barrier statements:

Ho: There are no barriers in upward mobility toward the position of superintendent that women perceive that differ from the barriers that men perceive as measured by the

Aspiring Superintendents Perceived Barriers Questionnaire.

These ten barriers statements are: predominance of male candidates for administrative positions, existence of the “buddy system” in which men refer other men to jobs, doubt by those in a hiring position of women’s long-term career commitment, exclusion from informal socialization process of “Good Old Boy Network,” lack of acceptance by female administrators, covert sex discrimination, gender bias in the screening and selection process, lack of acceptance by male administrators and staff, the belief that women must be better qualified than men in
order to attain top level administrative positions, and lack of strong women’s network similar to the “Good Old Boy Network.”

Table 4. Mann-Whitney U Test with Significant Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Barrier</th>
<th>Mann-Whitney U</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2 tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q13. Conflicting demands on career and family</td>
<td>694.500</td>
<td>.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14. Lack of ability to relocate as a result of personal commitment</td>
<td>634.500</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15. The belief that women do not make good administrators</td>
<td>649.00</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16. Inappropriate career path experiences</td>
<td>633.500</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17. Childhood socialization to “proper” roles for men and women</td>
<td>779.00</td>
<td>.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18. The predominance of male candidates for administrative positions</td>
<td>478.000</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19. Lack of a mentor</td>
<td>775.00</td>
<td>.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20. Existence of the “buddy system” in which men refer other men to jobs</td>
<td>486.500</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21. Doubt by those in a hiring position of women’s long term career commitment</td>
<td>474.500</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22. Lack of self-confidence in ability to succeed in top jobs</td>
<td>752.00</td>
<td>.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23. Gender bias in the screening and selection process</td>
<td>450.500</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24. Exclusion from informal socialization process of “Good Old Boy Network”</td>
<td>569.500</td>
<td>.027*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25. Lack of acceptance by male administrators and staff</td>
<td>442.000</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26. Lack of acceptance by female administrators and staff</td>
<td>574.000</td>
<td>.025*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27. Lack of political “know how”</td>
<td>709.500</td>
<td>.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28. Lack of motivation to compete for top jobs</td>
<td>764.500</td>
<td>.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29. The belief that women must be better qualified than men in order to attain top level administrative positions</td>
<td>412.500</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30. Lack of strong women’s network similar to the “Good Old Boy Network”</td>
<td>384.500</td>
<td>.001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31. Covert Sex Discrimination</td>
<td>547.500</td>
<td>.032*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32. Overt sex discrimination</td>
<td>640.000</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33. Potential colleagues’ insubordination in working for a female boss</td>
<td>620.000</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The information depicted on Table 41 indicates that there are barriers in upward mobility toward the position of superintendent that women perceive that differ from the barriers that men perceive as measured by the Aspiring Superintendents Perceived Barriers Questionnaire. According to the Mann-Whitney U test analysis, however, I accepted the null hypothesis for Research Question Two for 11 of the perceived barrier statements:

\[ \text{Ho: There are no barriers in upward mobility toward the position of superintendent that women perceive that differ from the barriers that men perceive as measured by the Aspiring Superintendents Perceived Barriers Questionnaire.} \]

These 11 perceived barrier statements are: conflicting demands of career and family, lack of ability to relocate as a result of personal commitment, the belief that women do not make good administrators, inappropriate career path experiences, childhood socialization to “proper” roles for men and women, lack of mentor, lack of self-confidence in ability to succeed in top jobs, lack of political “know how,” lack of motivation to compete for top jobs, overt sex discrimination, and potential colleagues’ insubordination in working for a female boss.

The information depicted on Table 41 indicates that there are some barriers in upward mobility toward the position of superintendent that women perceive that differ from the barriers that men perceive as measured by the Aspiring Superintendents Perceived Barriers Questionnaire.
In analyzing the results of the non-parametric Mann-Whitney U test, I found that there is statistically significant difference at the p<.05 level in the perceptions of barriers between men and women for 6 out of the 21 barrier statements. These barriers include: predominance of male candidates for administrative positions, existence of the “buddy system” in which men refer other men to jobs, doubt by those in a hiring position of women’s long-term career commitment, exclusion from informal socialization process of “Good Old Boy Network,” lack of acceptance by female administrators, and covert sex discrimination. The results indicate that women perceived these six barriers as an impediment to pursuing a superintendent position compared to men.

There is even more statistically significant difference in the mean rankings on four barrier statements that have p<.001. These four barrier statements include: gender bias in the screening and selection process (men, m=1.78; women, m=2.78; p<.001), lack of acceptance by male administrators and staff (men, m=1.57; women, m=2.59; p<.001), the belief that women must be better qualified than men in order to attain top-level administrative positions (men, m=1.53; women, m=2.60; p<.001), and lack of strong women’s network similar to the “Good Old Boy Network” (men, m=1.78; women, m=3.02; p<.001). The results indicate that women perceived these four barriers as an impediment to a superintendent position compared to men. The results indicated that there were not any barriers that men perceived as impediments to pursuing a superintendent position as compared to women. A complete mean rank table is included in Appendix O.
The statistical analysis for Research Question Two looked at the Mann-Whitney U test. I found a significant statistical difference between the perceived barriers of the male and female respondents on ten barrier statements. This statistical difference proves that women and men do differ in their perceptions of barriers toward the superintendency. Women perceive ten barrier statements as impediments to the superintendency while men do not perceive any barrier statements as impediments to securing the position.

Summary

Chapter 4 presented an analysis of the data collected from the research survey, entitled the Aspiring Superintendents Perceived Barrier Questionnaire. The survey data was used to determine to what extent aspiring superintendents perceive barriers as well as if there were significant differences between male and female perceived barriers in their upward mobility toward the superintendency. A demographic profile was created based on the 38 male and 46 female respondents. Frequency tables were also created to indicate the frequency of the population sampled for each perceived barrier statement in the survey and were further broken down by gender.

This data was used to answer the two research questions, which focused on barriers perceived by aspiring superintendents and how they differ by gender. Generally, women perceived more barriers than did their male counterparts. However, both men and women had similar perceived barriers involving family commitment and an inability to relocate for a job
when analyzing frequency of responses. The statistical analysis also revealed there were significant differences between male and female responses.
CHAPTER 5

FINDINGS DISCUSSION

Chapter 5 includes a brief summary of the study as well as conclusions based on findings. These findings are organized by the study’s research questions with relation to previous research and literature. Then the findings viewed through the study’s theoretical framework are discussed followed by implications for aspiring superintendents, recommendations for practice for both men and women, and recommendations for future research.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to identify to what extent aspiring superintendents perceive barriers in their aspirations toward the position of superintendent and to determine to what extent men and women differ in their perceptions of barriers to securing a superintendent position. A descriptive research design was utilized for the study. A questionnaire, Aspiring Superintendents Perceived Barriers Questionnaire (see Appendix E), was sent to current administrators in Illinois public schools with potential aspirations to the superintendency. Thirty-nine men and 46 women made up the research sample for this survey.

The survey questionnaire identified demographics of the administrators in the study and measured their perceptions of barriers in their advancement into a superintendent position.
through the use of a semantic differential scale. This data collected on perceptions of barriers was displayed using frequency and percentage distributions to determine low and high barriers perceived by respondents. The Mann-Whitney U test was also used to determine significant statistical difference. The findings from the statistical analysis of the data were presented in Chapter 4 and are reviewed in the following discussion of findings.

Discussion of Findings and Conclusions

Demographic Information Discussion

When demographic data was analyzed using frequency distributions, I was able to describe an aspiring superintendent in the study. An aspiring superintendent in this study is female, Caucasian/White, and between the ages of 40 and 49. The administrator is married and has at least two children. This person has at least a master’s degree and holds either a central office or principal position with between 6 and 10 years administrative experience. The school in which he/she works has at least 1,000 students and is most likely a high school in a district with between 1,000 and 4,999 students.

Because most of the previous barrier research focused on women alone, it is difficult to compare the gender composition of this study to others. Of interest, however, is that even though this survey was sent to both male and female participants, the majority of respondents were female. This finding supports prior research which found the majority of students enrolled in superintendent preparation programs are female. According to Glass (2000), women continue to
be the dominant gender in not only the teaching profession but superintendent preparation
programs as well. The fact that more women are being prepared for the superintendency but so
few are ultimately receiving the position further supports that barriers do exist for female
candidates.

Although most of the relevant research previously conducted focused on female
participants only, there are some similarities between the demographic findings of my study and
findings of other studies. With the exception of Walker’s (2014) study of African American
superintendents, other studies found the average superintendent to be Caucasian/White, including

The typical superintendent in Dulac’s (1992) study was between the ages of 40 and 49,
while Wickham (2007), Davis (2010), and Anderson (1998) found the typical superintendent to
be 50 and 59 specifically. Since the participants for my study were aspiring superintendents not
yet in the position, it makes sense that the median age was lower than studies conducted with
participants who were already superintendents.

Similar to my study, the representative participant in Dulac (1992), Anderson (1998),
Wickham (2007), Davis (2010), and Hunter (2013) were married. However, demographic
findings were different when analyzing the representative participant based on children. My
study asked participants to respond based on how many children they had (0, 1, 2, 3, or 4 or
more). Since the participants for this survey were aspiring superintendents and tended to be
younger than current superintendents surveyed in other studies, the typical administrator had at
least two children. Dulac, Wickham, Davis, and Hunter asked participants whether they had K-12 school-age children. Again, because the age of the participants in these studies was older, most respondents said they did not have K-12 school-age children.

The superintendents in studies done by Dulac (1992), Anderson (1998), Davis (2010) and Wickham (2007) held doctorate degrees. This is consistent with the fact that all participants in these surveys were current superintendents where having a doctoral degree is usually required or at least preferred. Most of the administrators for my study had a master’s degree. Interestingly, even though the majority of superintendents in Wickham’s (2007) study held a doctoral degree (48.2%), almost as many (45.5%) participants held only a master’s degree. This may indicate that in the state where Wickham’s study was completed, California, the requirement or expectation of having a doctoral degree is not necessary.

Although the average administrator for my study had at least 6-10 years of experience as a central office administrator or principal, average superintendents in Dulac and Anderson’s studies had 1-4 years of experience as superintendents. Since the participants for my survey are aspiring superintendents and many are currently enrolled in superintendent preparation programs, this suggests that prior to securing a superintendent position, administrators have 6-10 years of administrative experience.

Similar to the findings for my study where the district student population of participants was 1,000-4,999, the average size of the school districts of superintendents in other studies is 3,000 students. For research done by Dulac, Anderson, and Wickham, superintendents were
employed in districts with under 3,000 students while Davis and Hunter’s superintendent participants were employed in districts with 3,000-5,000 students.

Through the review of the literature, several themes emerged, including career advancement, leadership style, the selection process, and barrier research.

Perceptions of Barriers Discussion

Research Question One

To what extent do aspiring superintendents perceive barriers in their upward mobility toward the position of superintendent as measured by the Aspiring Superintendents Perceived Barriers Questionnaire? In order to answer this research question, I analyzed the frequency of answers as a whole for each barrier statement. Then, I analyzed the number of respondents answering, the frequency, and the median value for each barrier statement.

The data from the frequency distribution analysis supports two main barriers perceived by aspirants to the superintendency. Conflicting demands of career and family and lack of ability to relocate were indicated as high perceived barriers by respondents. Of interest is that these are both considered personal barriers. These findings are supported by research, but most recently by both Wickham (2007) and Davis (2010), who also identified these two barriers as significant in their studies.

Forty-two percent of the respondents from my study perceived conflicting demands of career and family as a high barrier. Other studies conducted on female administrators alone have
supported family demands and responsibilities as being barriers (Kowlaski & Stouder, 1999; Shakeshaft, 1998). This finding is significant because despite the common preconception that this is a barrier for women, it appears to be a barrier for all aspiring superintendents, both men and women.

Similarly, 40% of respondents in this study perceived the ability to relocate as a result of personal commitment as a high barrier. Grogan and Brunner had similar results in their 2005 study that cited relocation as a major barrier for women aspiring to the superintendency. Although Dana and Bourisaw (2000b) found the job of superintendent to be migratory, which was a barrier for women, my study shows that it is a barrier for all aspiring superintendents.

Of interest is that both barriers found to be high by respondents in the study are considered internal barriers. External barriers such as bias, exclusion from networking opportunities, and lack of mentor were not considered barriers by aspiring superintendents in my study when analyzing frequency distributions. The internal barriers of inability to relocate and family commitments were considered high barriers, which is consistent with findings of other studies as well (Foley, 2015; Kowalski & Stouder, 1999).

Lastly I analyzed the median values of each barrier statement. According to the median values, none of the participants perceived these barriers as impediments to securing a superintendent position. All perceived barrier statements had a median value of 1, 2, or 3. This is not a surprising finding since a comparison of findings by gender reveals female respondents perceived more barriers and in greater intensity than male respondents. This skews the median
values and the data set is not evenly distributed. A discussion of this comparison follows under the findings for Research Question Two.

Research Question Two

To what extent do the barriers in upward mobility toward the position of superintendent that women perceive differ from the barriers that men perceive as measured by the Aspiring Superintendents Perceived Barriers Questionnaire? When frequency distributions were examined by gender on each of the 21 questionnaire items, women respondents perceived 5 out of 21 barriers as major barriers while men perceived 3. Interestingly, these are the same top three barriers perceived by the female respondents in this study. Both men and women perceived conflicting demands of career and family, lack of ability to relocate because of personal commitment, and exclusion from informal socialization process of the “Good Old Boy Network” as major barriers. The internal barriers of family commitments and inability to relocate were also the only barriers perceived as high when analyzing the frequencies as a whole for Research Question One.

The review of literature and previous research supports these findings. Both Wickham (2007) and Davis (2010) identified the same three barriers as significant: conflicting demands of family, lack of ability to relocate because of personal commitment, and exclusion from the informal socialization process of the “Good Old Boy Network.” Other studies have supported family demands and responsibilities as being barriers (Kowalski & Stouder, 1999). Shakeshaft
(1998) found that balancing a career and family is an overwhelming barrier for women. Chase and Bell’s (1994) findings show that women have been hindered by traditional family roles. Even though Grogan and Brunner (2005) did not find family obligations as a barrier for women in their study, my findings support earlier studies which clearly state that family demands play a significant role for females wanting to move into a superintendent position.

Grogan and Brunner (2005) cited relocation as a major barrier for women aspiring to the superintendency. Similar findings occurred in Davis’s (2010) study of female superintendents in North Carolina. In Davis’s study, 64% of the participants rated this as a major barrier. In her qualitative study, Davis recounts that one superintendent during an interview shared that relocating for a superintendent position came at the cost of her marriage. Wickham’s (2007) study confirms this as well, with 50% of the participants citing the lack of ability to relocate as a prominent barrier. California female superintendents from that study strongly support the research regarding relocation that has been completed over the past several decades. The job of the superintendent has been described as migrant work, and the inability to relocate continues to be a formidable barrier, more so for women than for men (Dana & Bourisaw, 2006b). Relocation or lack of willingness to relocate is a barrier for females who aspire to the superintendency.

Exclusion from the “Good Old Boy Network” was the greatest barrier perceived by women in my study. Similar findings occurred for Wickham (2007) and Davis (2010). Wickham’s participants perceived this barrier as the second most prominent barrier while Davis’s participants perceived it as the third most significant barrier. Since other studies (Dana &
Bourisaw, 2006b; Glass, 2000; Kowalski & Stouder, 1999) found that breaking into the Good Old Boy Network was a positive factor in securing a superintendent position, it follows that exclusion from the network would be a significant barrier. Two respondents in Wickham’s qualitative study specifically used the words “Good Old Boy Network” in their interviews. Both agreed that this male-driven construct continues to be a barrier, and one stated, “Good Old Boys still seem to rule” (Wickham, 2007, p. 77).

One respondent, however, in Davis’s (2010) survey stated, “I experienced no barriers. In fact, my mentor was a male under whom I served as a teacher, principal, and assistant superintendent” (p.109). “The Good Old Boy Network” does exist, but some privileged women have managed access. However, it is unlikely that they have been granted full-privileged membership, but more of a “guest” access through association with powerful males (Davis, 2010). Significant about this is that being an aspiring superintendent alone is not enough to qualify a woman into the “Good Old Boy Network.” A male counterpart or mentor must bring her along. Based on this research and on a review of the literature, the “Good Old Boy Network” is perceived as a barrier for women aspiring to the superintendency.

It was difficult to find any literature that focused exclusively on male perceived barriers to the superintendency. There is research, however, that compares male and female assistant superintendent perceptions of various factors to securing a superintendent position. Hunter (2013) conducted a quantitative study in which current male and female assistant superintendents rated internal and external barriers, internal and external motivators, stressors, and discriminatory
acts as they anticipated a move into a superintendent position. Although Hunter used a different tool than was used for my study, there were similarities with the barrier statements used for certain items. A comparison of how males answered those similar barrier items is discussed here.

Although Hunter (2013) did not address an aspiring superintendent’s lack of ability to relocate specifically in her survey, she did include a rating statement that addressed relocation as a motivator. Since relocation was presented in Hunter’s survey as a positive motivator rather than a barrier, a comparison of the male responses from both studies cannot be done. The male respondents from Hunter’s study, however, did indicate that external barriers were more important for them in pursuing the position of superintendent. This fits with the findings of my survey since lack of acceptance into the “Good Old Boy Network” would be considered an external barrier construct. Also, men in Hunter’s study identified several stressors in securing the position of superintendent, including child care issues in the home and balancing personal and professional responsibilities. These findings support the findings in my study where men identified conflicting demands of career and family as a major barrier.

When a rating of “4” and a rating of “5” were combined to find the barriers that were perceived as high by respondents, 12 out of 21 barriers were considered high barriers by women and 4 were considered high by men. For women, this constitutes over half of the barriers that were presented for my study. In addition to the barriers mentioned previously that were perceived as major, the following barriers were considered high by women: predominance of male candidates for administrative positions, lack of mentor, existence of the “buddy system” in
which men refer other men to jobs, gender bias in the screening and selection process, lack of acceptance by male administrators and staff, lack of political know how, the belief that women must be better qualified than men in order to attain top-level administrative positions, lack of strong women’s network similar to the “Good Old Boy Network,” and covert sex discrimination.

In addition to the aforementioned barriers considered major by men, lack of a mentor and inappropriate career path were perceived as high barriers by male respondents. Hunter’s (2013) findings are similar, with men identifying external barriers such as absence of mentors at a district level as a barrier to the superintendency. Interestingly, women did not perceive inappropriate career path as a high barrier in my study even though research supports administrative positions typically held by women, such as elementary school principal, are not considered gateway positions to the superintendency (Sharp & Walter, 2004).

When comparing the barriers that women perceive and the barriers that men perceive using frequency distributions, the greatest barrier perceived by women was exclusion from informal socialization process of the “Good Old Boy Network.” Men also identified this as their greatest barrier tied with the barrier of lack of ability to relocate as a result of personal commitment. These findings are different from the finding of Hunter’s (2013) study, which compared perceptions of various barriers of both male and female assistant superintendents. In her study, male assistant superintendents from New York reported that external barriers, including exclusion from a socialization network, were more important to them in their pursuit of the superintendency than the female assistant superintendents reported. Female assistant
superintendents in her study, however, perceived internal barriers, such as the lack of ability to relocate, as being more important than the male respondents perceived.

More men, almost half, indicated that lack of ability to relocate as a result of personal commitment was a high barrier, compared to only one-third of women indicating it was a high barrier as was the case with lack of mentor, which was indicated as high by one-third of men but only one-quarter of women. These findings are similar to Hunter’s (2013) since lack of a mentor would be considered an external barrier.

Lastly women had nine barriers that were indicated as high that were not indicated by men as high. These barriers are as follows: predominance of male candidates for administrative positions, existence of the “buddy system” in which men refer other men to jobs, gender bias in the screening and selection process, exclusion from informal socialization process of “Good Old Boy Network,” lack of acceptance by male administrators and staff, lack of political know how, the belief that women must be better qualified than men in order to attain top-level administrative positions, lack of strong women’s network similar to the “Good Old Boy Network,” and covert sex discrimination.

The findings from my study regarding which barriers were perceived the least by male and female participants are important because even though participants perceived some barriers as low, men perceived more barriers as low than their female counterparts. This is consistent with the findings that women perceived more barriers as high than their male counterparts.
Female respondents perceived barriers that involved lack of self-confidence, lack of motivation to compete for top jobs, and lack of acceptance by other female staff as low barriers.

Male respondents also indicated that lack of acceptance by female staff was a low barrier but also perceived lack of acceptance by male staff as a low barrier. It is interesting that women did not perceive lack of acceptance by male staff as a low barrier but men did. This indicates that although women feel accepted by female staff, they do not feel accepted by male staff. Men also perceived a female candidate’s ability to lead and being socialized to proper gender roles as low barriers. Since it is vital that male and female leaders work together to create cultures that recognize gender equity, these findings are important.

The Mann-Whitney U test conducted for my study also found the female respondents’ barrier perceptions as high. Women’s mean rank was higher for 17 out of 21 barrier statements while men’s mean rank was higher on 4 of the perceived barriers. The female respondents’ mean rank (see Appendix P) average was higher than the male mean rank average as well. Since a higher rank was considered a higher barrier perception, women ranked more statements higher and their mean rank score was higher as well.

When looking at the Mann-Whitney U test statistics (see Appendix N), I analyzed the p-value for significance. I noticed ten perceived barriers with statistically significant difference ($p < .05$ and $p < .001$) as indicated in Table 4. The results indicated that women perceived these six barriers as an impediment to pursuing a superintendent position compared to men. Therefore, I rejected the null hypothesis for those ten barrier statements. Although there were some barrier
statements where men had a higher mean rank (see Appendix O), none of these barriers showed significant statistical difference on the Mann-Whitney U test.

These findings are different from the findings of Hunter (2013). She found there was a significant difference between male and female assistant superintendents for the variables of external motivators, discrimination, and willingness, but there was not a significant difference between male and females on internal or external barriers. Males in her study reported external motivators as more important while females in her study found discriminatory acts to be an important factor in pursuing the superintendency. The male assistant superintendents in the Hunter study tended to agree that they were willing to pursue the position of superintendent while the female respondents were less willing to pursue the position of superintendent, which is consistent with the findings of this study.
Theoretical Framework Discussion

Findings from this study reflect the theoretical framework and literature reviewed in preparation for this study. The findings are consistent with previous studies that examined perceived barriers of females who aspire to the superintendency. However, the findings from this study are important because not only do they compare and identify barriers perceived by both men and women, but barriers perceived by men are also represented. Few studies have examined barriers perceived by men as well. Because current research is limited regarding differences in barriers perceived by men and women, findings from this study could expand existing literature and research.

Lewin’s gatekeeping theory (1947), a feminist perspective, and Kanter’s structural theory (1977) formed the theoretical framework for this study. A discussion of the findings of this study viewed from the perspective of the theories and perspectives that framed it follow. This discussion further emphasizes the importance of cognizance of gender disparities by male and female leaders.

School boards, consultant firms, and current superintendents act as gatekeepers making the critical decisions as to who advances through the channels that lead to a superintendent position. Findings from this study indicate that the informal Good Old Boy Network should also be considered as a gatekeeper. Both men and women perceived exclusion from the Good Old Boy Network as a barrier to reaching the superintendency. Although an informal social
construct, the Good Old Boy Network does act as a gatekeeper for aspiring superintendents. This socialization process provides opportunities for aspiring superintendents to network, or in other words, open gates to potential positions. If an aspiring superintendent is excluded from this opportunity, it creates a barrier to securing the superintendent position.

Statistically, women perceived gender bias in the screening and selection process as well as existence of the “buddy system,” in which men refer other men to jobs, as significant barriers. Both of these processes should be considered through the lens of Lewin’s gatekeeping theory. If gender bias in the screening and selection process is considered a barrier by women, then those gates are already closed to them before they even consider applying for the position. Furthermore, since the predominance of superintendents are men, the process of the buddy system can only further hinder a woman’s ability to secure that interview for the top position.

The feminist view that women have not been given equal opportunities for advancement in education should also be considered when discussing the findings from this study. When analyzing the Mann-Whitney U test results, there were ten barrier statements where there was a statistically significant difference between male and female responses. Women perceived these ten barriers as an impediment to securing the superintendent position and men did not. Of these ten, five should be viewed from a feminist perspective and involve doubt in women’s abilities, lack of acceptance by male and female staff, and discrimination. Given the current political climate in the United States, it is imperative that both men and women are cognizant of providing equal opportunities for advancement in education regardless of gender.
Lastly Kanter’s (1977) views on organizational structures and how they shape gender compositions of the leaders at the top were evident in the findings of this study. Several of the barrier statements where there was a significant statistical difference between male and female responses included constructs that implied organizational structures and cultural norms were impediments. Kanter suggests that the more advantageously one is placed within an organization, the more likely that person is to aspire and to encourage others to do the same. If there is doubt by those in a hiring position of women’s long-term career commitment, as is indicated by the Mann-Whitney U test as a significant barrier for women, anticipatory socialization cannot occur.

This theory can also be used to explain why 67% of female respondents (see Table 2) indicated that they do not currently aspire to a superintendent position. If women are in organizational structures where the gender composition of top leaders is male, they may not aspire to the position even though they are just as qualified and prepared as their male counterparts. Sixty-three percent of male respondents in this study indicated that they aspire to the superintendency, which indicates that they do have anticipatory socialization within their organizational structures.

Implications and Recommendations

The findings of this study have implications for male and female aspirants to the superintendency. Both men and women respondents in this study acknowledged that barriers do exist for those aspiring to the superintendency, although the female respondents perceived the
barriers more intensely and in greater quantity. The greatest barrier for both men and women in this study involved networking. This includes a lack of networking opportunities as well as not being included in informal social networks. Aspiring superintendents should seek out opportunities to network, be it through professional organizations, educational cohorts, or within their own school district among other administrators. Visibility within the professional arena is an important aspect of breaking into informal social networks.

Both female and male respondents also noted that balancing the demands of career and family could be a barrier to securing a superintendency. Aspiring superintendents should seek support for meeting family demands. Balancing a career and family has long been a barrier for female professionals and with changes to family dynamics, it is now a barrier for males seeking the superintendency as well. By learning how to cope with these demands, aspiring superintendents will enhance the chances of success in attaining and retaining a top-level administration position.

Aspiring superintendents should also be willing to relocate or commute in order to secure a superintendent position. Being bound to a specific location or region will severely limit a candidate’s perspectives. Although both men and women perceived this as a major barrier, more men identified this as a barrier. Having a support system in place to balance the demands of career and family will also alleviate this barrier. With the amount of superintendent vacancies estimated to open up in the near future, the willingness to relocate will definitely help in accessing the position.
Lack of a mentor was also identified as a significant barrier for both men and women. Aspiring superintendents should seek out individuals who would be willing to mentor them through the process of acquiring a superintendent position. Once aspiring superintendents are in the top-level position, they should be willing to mentor upcoming leaders regardless of gender. Although discrimination did not come up as a significant barrier in this study, educational leaders should be cognizant of their own perceptions of gender and leadership. Recognizing potential leaders based on characteristics rather than gender will go a long way to eliminating barriers.

Male aspiring superintendents perceived inappropriate career paths as a barrier. This may be a result of systematic constructs that suggest that men must be either an athletic director or high school principal in order to become a superintendent. If a male administrator is an elementary school principal or middle school principal, they may feel as if they do not have the same opportunities for advancement. Aspiring superintendents should strategically plan for career advancement. Seeking a broad level of experiences in various positions will increase opportunities for advancement.

In order to lessen barriers perceived by aspiring female superintendents, the researcher recommends the following practices. Universities should capitalize on the predominance of female candidates in educational leadership programs by addressing issues of gender barriers. Superintendent preparation programs can use this opportunity to encourage networking, family support systems, and mentorships as well as assisting women in developing a strong self-
concept. Quality preparation programs can also provide vital knowledge needed for effective management of instructional, political, and financial facets.

Professional search firms should be cognizant of gender bias when conducting a candidate search. As was outlined by the literature review in Chapter 2, search firms act as gatekeepers for candidates aspiring to the superintendency. Since this is such a vital role in the process of selecting superintendents, it is important that these firms know the disparity that exists for female candidates.

Professional development organizations can use this data to better prepare female administrators seeking a superintendent position. By educating aspiring female superintendents on the perceived barriers that exist, women can proactively break down these barriers through networking, setting up family support systems, and seeking mentors. These organizations can also serve to inform school boards who hire superintendents on the key leadership skills that female candidates bring to the position.

Lastly men and women must work together to develop as leaders and guide best educational opportunities for all children. It is vital for male and female children to have strong leaders as role models represented by both genders. Little girls and boys should see women leading, not only in the classroom but in also in the superintendent’s office.
Benefit Assessment

The benefits to the field that were gained from this study include further exploration of the perceptions that aspiring superintendents have regarding attaining the superintendent position. Furthermore, the study determined perceived barriers of aspiring superintendents do indeed differ between men and women. This benefits the field of educational administration by adding to the research and raising awareness of the potential barriers for both men and women. Benefits to the participants include an opportunity to reflect upon perceived barriers in the quest for a superintendent position. Minimizing the gender gap that exists in the current superintendent field is vital and identifying perceived barriers that may differ between men and women is an important step.

Suggestions for Further Research

Based on the findings of this study along with a review of current literature, the following recommendations for further study include:

1. Since the population size of this study was relatively small, a similar descriptive study with a larger population size is recommended. Little research exists that compares perceived barriers of both men and women. Accessing a larger sample population will lead to further insights regarding barriers perceived by all aspiring superintendents.

2. Similar to the quantitative studies done by Dulac (1992) and Anderson (1998), a study that includes both perceived barriers and successful strategies of male and
female current superintendents would be beneficial. In this way, researchers would have additional insight into the barriers that exist for aspiring superintendents as well as successful strategies that were utilized to secure a superintendent position.

3. An investigation of current superintendent endorsement holders in the state of Illinois who have not sought a superintendent position would be beneficial. Assessing the barriers they have experienced to securing a superintendent position would add to the volume of research for both male and female candidates.

4. Further study into the gender makeup of school boards and their recruiting, selecting, and hiring practices would be valuable. Since school boards are such an important part of the hiring process for superintendent candidates, the influence they have over the gender composition of superintendent candidates is immense.

5. Further research regarding the gender makeup of professional search firm consultants and their recruiting, selecting, and hiring practices would be insightful. Since search firms are referred to as the gatekeepers in the superintendent search process, knowing what, if any, gender biases exist within these firms will prove invaluable.

6. A study that looks at the number of interviews female candidates have before securing a superintendent position compared to the number of interviews that male candidates have before securing a superintendent position would be insightful for barriers experienced by female aspiring superintendents.
7. A study of superintendent preparation programs at universities which would assess how female candidates are being prepared to face the barriers that exist in securing a superintendent position. Since the predominance of candidates in superintendent preparation programs are female, determining how or if programs are addressing gender disparities would prove helpful.

8. Further research of women in administration in other fields such as business and medicine should be conducted to see if they perceive similar barriers to their own upward mobility.

9. A study that looks at mentoring practices of current superintendents would be useful, such as research that identifies whether or not the gender of the superintendent affects the gender of the mentee and whether or not the superintendent uses different approaches to mentor based on gender.

Conclusions

Increased accountability and a difficult economic climate have produced an increased scrutiny of schools (Glass & Franceschini, 2007). Superintendents’ roles and responsibilities are continually evolving and have become more visible to the public. The role of superintendent is politically, financially and administratively complex. The complexity of the role can make the position attractive to some and unattractive to others.
This study demonstrated that both male and female aspiring superintendents perceive similar barriers to securing a superintendent position, but to different degrees. Female participants perceived more barriers and at a greater intensity. The major barriers discovered for both male and females were conflicting demands of career and family, lack of ability to relocate due to personal commitments, and exclusion from social networks similar to the “Good Old Boy Network.” It is vital that men and women work together to support each other and develop as leaders. This will lead to better and more equitable opportunities for boys and girls who aspire to one day be leaders in the field of education.

Statistically, this study revealed that perceived barriers exist for female aspiring superintendents, which may contribute to the lack of women in the position. Through networking opportunities within professional development organizations, however, women can increase their visibility in the professional arena and garner sponsorship into typically male-oriented networks. Increasing flexibility in relocating and creating supportive family systems assist women in being able to attain a superintendent position. Women should also foster mentoring relationships as either mentees or mentors in order to increase opportunities for aspiring superintendents. By doing these things, women can proactively begin to break down barriers and secure the ultimate position in education.
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APPENDIX A

NIU PERMISSION TO ADMINISTER SURVEY EMAIL
Permission to administer survey during cohort classes

6 messages

Maureen Cassidy <mcassidy@d15.org>  
To: proberts1@niu.edu  
Cc: Bradley Hawk <bhawk@niu.edu>, Rosita Lopez <dllopez@niu.edu>

Hello Dr. Roberts,
My name is Maureen Cassidy and I am a current doctoral student at NIU. We briefly spoke about a month ago with Dr. Burgin regarding permission for me to administer my dissertation survey to superintendent preparation students at NIU. Dr. Hawk suggested that I send you an email so that I have written permission. My dissertation topic is Gender Differences in Perceived Barriers of Aspiring Superintendents. My survey will ask aspiring superintendents to rate perceived barriers to securing the position of superintendent. Then I will compare whether barriers perceived by men differ from barriers perceived by women. I would like your permission to visit current superintendent preparation classes before the end of Spring semester (if I can get my IRB approval done quickly enough). Please let me know if you have any questions.
Thank you so much for the consideration.
Maureen Cassidy

--

Ms. Maureen Cassidy Ed.S.
Executive Director of Bilingual Education
McHenry School District 15
815-385-7210

Patrick Roberts <proberts1@niu.edu>  
To: Maureen Cassidy <mcassidy@d15.org>  
Cc: Bradley Hawk <bhawk@niu.edu>, Rosita Lopez <dllopez@niu.edu>

Hi Maureen -

Do you have a copy of the survey I can review?

From: Maureen Cassidy <mcassidy@d15.org>  
Date: Tuesday, March 22, 2016 at 10:42 AM  
To: Patrick Roberts <proberts1@niu.edu>  
Cc: Bradley Hawk <bhawk@niu.edu>, Rosita Lopez <dllopez@niu.edu>  
Subject: Permission to administer survey during cohort classes

Yes, of course. Here you go.
Thanks!
[Quoted text hidden]

Maureen Cassidy <mcassidy@d15.org>  
To: Patrick Roberts <proberts1@niu.edu>  
Cc: Bradley Hawk <bhawk@niu.edu>, Rosita Lopez <dllopez@niu.edu>, Ximena Burgin <xreca1d1@niu.edu>

Yes, of course. Here you go.
Thanks!
[Quoted text hidden]

SurveyMonkey_75326485.pdf
262K

Patrick Roberts <proberts1@niu.edu>  
Tue, Mar 22, 2016 at 11:17 AM

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/1?ui=2&ik=61841513a&jsver=8rKKSAtb7d4U.1.en.&(view=pt&qdr)%20proberts1%40niu.edu&qs=true&search=query&th... 1/2
8/21/2017
d15.org Mail - Permission to administer survey during cohort classes

To: Maureen Cassidy <mcassidy@d15.org>
Cc: Bradley Hawk <bhawk@niu.edu>, Rosita Lopez <dlopez@niu.edu>, Ximena Burgin <xrecald1@niu.edu>

Thank you, Maureen. Yes, I give you permission to visit these classes, I assume you'll provide the students with an informed consent document.

Good luck.

From: Maureen Cassidy <mcassidy@d15.org>
Date: Tuesday, March 22, 2016 at 10:47 AM
To: Patrick Roberts <proberts1@niu.edu>
Cc: Bradley Hawk <bhawk@niu.edu>, Rosita Lopez <dlopez@niu.edu>, Ximena Burgin <xrecald1@niu.edu>
Subject: Re: Permission to administer survey during cohort classes

Rosita Lopez <dlopez@niu.edu> Tue, Mar 22, 2016 at 11:18 AM
To: Patrick Roberts <proberts1@niu.edu>, Maureen Cassidy <mcassidy@d15.org>
Cc: Bradley Hawk <bhawk@niu.edu>, Ximena Burgin <xrecald1@niu.edu>

Great news. Thank you Patrick!

From: Patrick Roberts <proberts1@niu.edu>
Date: Tuesday, March 22, 2016 at 11:17 AM
To: "mcassidy@d15.org" <mcassidy@d15.org>

Maureen Cassidy <mcassidy@d15.org> Tue, Mar 22, 2016 at 11:19 AM
To: Rosita Lopez <dlopez@niu.edu>
Cc: Patrick Roberts <proberts1@niu.edu>, Bradley Hawk <bhawk@niu.edu>, Ximena Burgin <xrecald1@niu.edu>

Yes, I have that ready to go as well. Thank you so much for your assistance.
Have a great day!
Maureen

[Quoted text hidden]
APPENDIX B

MCHENRY DISTRICT 15 PERMISSION LETTER TO ADMINISTER SURVEY
March 3, 2016

Institutional Review Board
Northern Illinois University
Office of Research, Compliance, and Integrity
Lowden Hall, 301
Dekalb, Illinois 60115

To Whom It May Concern,

McHenry Community Consolidated School District #15 is aware of the study that Maureen Cassidy is conducting as partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctorate of Education through Northern Illinois University. The district’s administrators and I understand that Ms. Cassidy’s intent is to study perceived barriers to securing a superintendent position. Furthermore, District 15 is aware that Ms. Cassidy intends to identify herself as the Executive Director of Bilingual Education of District 15.

District 15 approves of this study being conducted. Additionally, we provide consent for Ms. Cassidy to identify herself as a researcher and an employee of McHenry District 15 in this study.

Sincerely,

R. Alan Hoffman
Superintendent
APPENDIX C

IRB INFORMED CONSENT
HUMAN SUBJECTS CONSENT FORM

ADULT (18 or older)

NORTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY

DEPARTMENT OF LEADERSHIP, EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY, AND FOUNDATIONS

I agree to participate in the research study titled *Gender Differences in Perceived Barriers of Aspiring Superintendents* being conducted by Maureen Cassidy, a doctoral student at Northern Illinois University. I have been informed that the purpose of this study is to determine if barriers perceived to securing a superintendent position differ between men and women.

I understand that if I agree to participate in this study, I will be asked to complete a survey.

I am aware that my participation is voluntary and may be withdrawn at any time without penalty or prejudice, and that if I have any additional questions concerning this study, I may contact Maureen Cassidy at (815) 385-7210. I understand that if I wish further information regarding my rights as a research subject, I may contact the Office of Research Compliance at Northern Illinois University at (815) 753-8588.

I understand that the intended benefits of this study include an increased knowledge of perceived barriers to securing a superintendent position.

I have been informed that there are no potential risks and/or discomforts I could experience during this study. I understand that all information gathered during this experiment will be kept confidential by having surveys submitted anonymously in a plain envelope (for face-to-face administration) and by anonymous submission of surveys via Survey Monkey (for online administration).

I understand that my completion of this survey implies my consent to participate and that my consent to participate in this project does not constitute a waiver of any legal rights or redress I might have as a result of my participation, and I acknowledge that I have received a copy of this consent form.
Dear Administrator,

I am in the process of completing my doctoral dissertation through Northern Illinois University. The main purpose of my research is to determine if perceived barriers to securing a superintendent position differ between men and women. Nationally, the percentage of women superintendents continues to be very small so this study would serve as a basis to understanding whether perceived barrier differences contribute to this disparity.

Your name was selected as a possible participant because of your enrollment in the Ed.S. or Ed.D. program. Your contribution to this study will be invaluable. Responses will remain anonymous and confidential. All surveys will be destroyed upon completion of this study. Results of the study will be available upon request.

If you could, please complete the enclosed survey. The entire survey should take no longer than 15 minutes. After completing the survey, please seal it back in the envelope. Your instructor will collect the envelopes and give them to the researcher who will be outside the classroom while the survey is completed.

Thank you in advance for your participation. Please feel free to keep this letter with my contact information in case you have any further questions about this study. My cell phone number is (815) 353-6574 and my work phone number is (815) 385-7210. I can also be reached at my email address, mcassidy@d15.org.

Sincerely,

Maureen Cassidy
APPENDIX E

SURVEY
Aspiring Superintendents Perceived Barriers Questionnaire

This survey measures the perceptions of aspiring superintendents regarding barriers to career advancement. Your responses should be indicative of your own experiences in administration. This is not a test. There are no right or wrong answers. Please express your opinion in response to each item. This questionnaire is anonymous, so do not sign your name. Thank you for participating in my survey. Your feedback is important.

I. BIOGRAPHIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. Do you aspire to a superintendent position sometime in your administrative career?
   - Yes
   - No

   Comment: ____________________________

2. The highest degree I hold is:
   - BA/BS
   - MA/MS
   - EdS
   - PhD/EdD
   - Other (please specify) ____________________________
3. Indicate how many years you have of administrative experience.

4. Please indicate the position title(s) you currently hold. Please check all that apply:
   - [ ] Assistant Principal
   - [ ] Principal
   - [ ] Central Office Administrator
   - [ ] Program Director
   - [ ] Assistant Superintendent
   - [ ] Department Head
   - [ ] Athletic Director
   - [ ] Other (please specify) 

5. Please indicate the type of school in which you work. Please check all that apply:
   - [ ] Elementary School
   - [ ] Middle School
   - [ ] High School
   - [ ] Other (please specify) 

6. The student enrollment in my school is (if applicable):
7. The student enrollment in my district is:
   - Fewer than 1,000
   - 1,000-4,999
   - Greater than 5,000
   - Other (please specify)

8. Which race/ethnic group best describes you. Please check all that apply:
   - African American/Black (non-Hispanic)
   - Asian American/Asian
   - Caucasian/White
   - Latino-Hispanic
   - Native American
   - Other (please specify)

9. To which gender group do you belong:
   - Male
   - Female
10. Age:
   - Under 25
   - 25-29
   - 30-39
   - 40-49
   - 50-59
   - 60 or over

11. Marital Status:
   - Single
   - Married
   - Widowed
   - Divorced or Separated

12. Number of children:
   - 0
   - 1
   - 2
   - 3
   - 4 or more

Aspiring Superintendents Perceived Barriers Questionnaire

II. Perceptions of Barriers

Please indicate the number on the scale that best describes your perception of possible barriers when attempting to secure the superintendency.
13. Conflicting demands on career and family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-Not a Major Barrier</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5-Major Barrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Lack of ability to relocate as a result of personal commitment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-Not a Major Barrier</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5-Major Barrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. The belief that women do not make good administrators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-Not a Major Barrier</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5-Major Barrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Inappropriate career path experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-Not a Major Barrier</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5-Major Barrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Childhood socialization to "proper" roles for men and women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-Not a Major Barrier</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5-Major Barrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. The predominance of male candidates for administrative positions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-Not a Major Barrier</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5-Major Barrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. Lack of a mentor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not a Major Barrier</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5-Major Barrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Existence of the "buddy system" in which men refer other men to jobs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not a Major Barrier</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5-Major Barrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Doubt by those in a hiring position of women's long term career commitment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not a Major Barrier</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5-Major Barrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Lack of self confidence in ability to succeed in top jobs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not a Major Barrier</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5-Major Barrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Gender bias in the screening and selection process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not a Major Barrier</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5-Major Barrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Exclusion from informal socialization process of "Good Old Boy Network".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not a Major Barrier</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5-Major Barrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. Lack of acceptance by male administrators and staff.
26. Lack of acceptance by female administrators and staff.

27. Lack of political "know how".

28. Lack of motivation to compete for top jobs.

29. The belief that women must be better qualified than men in order to attain top level administrative positions.

30. Lack of strong women's network similar to the "Good Old Boy Network".

31. Covert sex discrimination.
32. Overt sex discrimination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-Not a Major Barrier</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5-Major Barrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. Potential colleagues’ insubordination in working for a female boss.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1-Not a Major Barrier</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5-Major Barrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Please cite other barriers that you perceive impacting upward mobility into a superintendent position.
APPENDIX F

INTRODUCTORY EMAIL FOR ONLINE PARTICIPANTS
Dear Administrator,

My name is Maureen Cassidy and I am in the process of completing my doctoral dissertation through Northern Illinois University. The main purpose of my research is to determine if perceived barriers to securing a superintendent position differ between men and women. Nationally, the percentage of women superintendents continues to be very small so this study would serve as a basis to understanding whether perceived barrier differences contribute to this disparity.

Your name was selected as a possible participant because of your current position as a school administrator. Your contribution to this study will be invaluable. Responses will remain anonymous and confidential. All surveys will be destroyed upon completion of this study. Results of the study will be available upon request.

If you could, please take a couple of minutes to read the attached IRB Human Subjects Consent Form. Completion of the survey implies your consent. The click on this link https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/RBS5RDF to complete the survey. The entire survey should take no longer than 15 minutes. I would like to have surveys completed by April 15th.

Thank you in advance for your participation. Please feel free to print this email with my contact information in case you have any further questions about this study. My cell phone number is (815) 353-6574 and my work phone number is (815) 385-7210. I can also be reached at my email address, mcassidy@d15.org.

Sincerely,

Maureen Cassidy
APPENDIX G

INTRODUCTORY LETTER FOR ONLINE PARTICIPANTS
Dear Administrator,

I am in the process of completing my doctoral dissertation through Northern Illinois University. The main purpose of my research is to determine if perceived barriers to securing a superintendent position differ between men and women. Nationally, the percentage of women superintendents continues to be very small so this study would serve as a basis to understanding whether perceived barrier differences contribute to this disparity.

Your name was selected as a possible participant because of your current position as a school administrator. Your contribution to this study will be invaluable. Responses will remain anonymous and confidential. All surveys will be destroyed upon completion of this study. Results of the study will be available upon request.

If you could, please complete the attached survey through Survey Monkey. The entire survey should take no longer than 15 minutes.

Thank you in advance for your participation. Please feel free to keep this letter with my contact information in case you have any further questions about this study. My cell phone number is (815) 353-6574 and my work phone number is (815) 385-7210. I can also be reached at my email address, mcassidy@d15.org.

Sincerely,

Maureen Cassidy
APPENDIX H

DULAC PERMISSION
Questionnaire On Perceptions Of Barriers And Strategies Impacting On Women Securing the Superintendency

I. BIOGRAPHIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please circle the most appropriate answer.

1. Gender
   a. Male
   b. Female

2. Age
   a. under 25 years
   b. 25 - 29
   c. 30 - 39
   d. 40 - 49
   e. 50 - 69
   f. 60 or over

3. Marital Status
   a. Single
   b. Married
   c. Widowed
   d. Divorced or Separated

4. Occupation
   a. Agricultural
   b. Homemaker
   c. Managerial
   d. Professional In Education
   e. Professional not in Education
   f. Sales
   g. Skilled Trades
   h. Technical
   i. Other
   j. Retired

5. Number of Children In School (K-12)
   a. 0
   b. 1
   c. 2
   d. 3
   e. 4 or more

6. Highest Degree Earned
   a. High School Diploma
   b. Associate’s
   c. Bachelor’s
   d. Master’s
   e. Doctorate

7. Racial/Ethnic Origin
   a. American Indian/Alaskan Native
   b. Asian or Pacific Islander
   c. Hispanic
   d. Black, not Hispanic origin
   e. White, not Hispanic origin

8. Number of Students In Your District
   a. 1 - 299
   b. 300 - 599
   c. 600 - 999
   d. 1,000 - 2,999
   e. 3,000 - 4,999
   f. 5,000 - 9,999
   g. 10,000 - 24,999
   h. 25,000 - 49,999
   i. 50,000 or more

9. Metro Status of Community Where Employed
   a. Rural (under 2,500 pop.)
   b. Town or small city (2,500 - 9,999 pop.)
   c. Suburb (10,000 - 99,999 pop.)
   d. Urban center or large city (100,000 or more)

10. Present Salary Range
    a. under $25,000
    b. $25,000 - $29,999
    c. $30,000 - $34,999
    d. $35,000 - $39,999
    e. $40,000 - $44,999
    f. $45,000 - $49,999
    g. $50,000 - $54,999
    h. $55,000 - $59,999
    i. $60,000 - $64,999
    j. $65,000 - $69,999
    k. $70,000 or more

11. Household Income
    a. under $25,000
    b. $25,000 - $29,999
    c. $30,000 - $34,999
    d. $35,000 - $39,999
    e. $40,000 - $44,999
    f. $45,000 - $49,999
    g. $50,000 - $54,999
    h. $55,000 - $59,999
    i. $60,000 - $64,999
    j. $65,000 - $69,999
    k. $70,000 - $74,999
    l. $75,000 or more
12. Number of Years as School Board President
   a. Less than a year
   b. 1 - 4
   c. 5 - 8
   d. 9 or more

13. Number of Years as School Board Member Including Presidency
   a. Less than a year
   b. 1 - 4
   c. 5 - 8
   d. 9 or more

14. Incumbent Superintendent in Your District in Present Position
   a. Less than a year
   b. 1 - 4 years
   c. 5 - 8
   d. 9 or more

15. Number of Women Applicants for Most Recent Superintendent Vacancy
   a. 0
   b. 1
   c. 2
   d. 3
   e. 4
   f. 5 or more

16. Number of Women Finalists for Position of Superintendent in Most Recent Search
   a. 0
   b. 1
   c. 2
   d. 3
   e. 4
   f. 5 or more

II. PERCEPTIONS OF BARRIERS

Please circle the number on the scale that best describes your perception of the possible barrier that women must contend with when attempting to secure the superintendency.

1. Conflicting demands of career and family.
   1 2 3 4 5
   not a barrier a major barrier

2. Lack of ability to relocate as a result of personal commitments.
   1 2 3 4 5
   not a barrier a major barrier

3. Lack of support or encouragement from female colleagues.
   1 2 3 4 5
   not a barrier a major barrier

4. The belief that women do not make good administrators.
   1 2 3 4 5
   not a barrier a major barrier

5. Inappropriate career path experiences.
   1 2 3 4 5
   not a barrier a major barrier

6. Childhood socialization to "proper" roles for men and women.
   1 2 3 4 5
   not a barrier a major barrier

7. The predominance of male candidates for administrative positions.
   1 2 3 4 5
   not a barrier a major barrier
   1 2 3 4 5  
   not a barrier  a major barrier

9. Existence of the "buddy system" in which men refer other men for jobs.  
   1 2 3 4 5  
   not a barrier  a major barrier

10. Low self-esteem.  
    1 2 3 4 5  
    not a barrier  a major barrier

11. Doubt by those in a hiring position of women's long term career commitment.  
    1 2 3 4 5  
    not a barrier  a major barrier

12. Lack of self-confidence in ability to succeed in top jobs.  
   1 2 3 4 5  
   not a barrier  a major barrier

13. Gender bias in the screening and selection process.  
    1 2 3 4 5  
    not a barrier  a major barrier

14. Exclusion from informal socialization process of "Good Old Boy Network".  
    1 2 3 4 5  
    not a barrier  a major barrier

15. Lack of self-confidence in public sphere activities such as interacting with community organizations, nurturing contacts, addressing audiences.  
    1 2 3 4 5  
    not a barrier  a major barrier

16. Ineffective or non-existent recruiting procedures for enlisting women to the superintendent.  
    1 2 3 4 5  
    not a barrier  a major barrier

17. Lack of acceptance by male administrators and staff.  
    1 2 3 4 5  
    not a barrier  a major barrier

18. Limited experience in the area of finance.  
    1 2 3 4 5  
    not a barrier  a major barrier
19. Lack of acceptance by female administrators and staff.  
   not a barrier  a major barrier

20. Lack of political "know-how" necessary to function at top level administrative positions.  
   not a barrier  a major barrier

21. Lack of motivation to compete for top jobs.  
   not a barrier  a major barrier

22. Guilt about pursuing a nontraditional role in education.  
   not a barrier  a major barrier

23. Concern that success in top level positions may entail rejection as a woman.  
   not a barrier  a major barrier

24. Limited access to training opportunities provided for male colleagues such as administrative internships, appointment to leadership positions on committees.  
   not a barrier  a major barrier

25. The belief that women must be better qualified than men in order to attain top level administrative positions.  
   not a barrier  a major barrier

26. Lack of a strong women's network similar to the "Good Old Boy Network".  
   not a barrier  a major barrier

27. Covert sex discrimination.  
   not a barrier  a major barrier

   not a barrier  a major barrier

29. Potential colleagues' insubordination in working for a female boss.  
   not a barrier  a major barrier
Please cite other barriers that you perceive to impact on women securing the superintendency:

III. PERCEPTIONS OF STRATEGIES

Please circle the number on the scale that best represents your perception of each strategy as it relates to women securing the superintendency.

1. Increasing visibility in professional circles.
   
   not successful
   highly successful

2. Obtaining a doctorate.
   
   not successful
   highly successful

3. Formulating and adhering to a plan of action to achieve career goals.
   
   not successful
   highly successful

4. Preparing an effective resume.
   
   not successful
   highly successful

5. Utilizing a women’s network similar to the “Good Old Boy Network”.
   
   not successful
   highly successful

6. Enhancing interviewing skills.
   
   not successful
   highly successful

7. Gaining access to community power groups.
   
   not successful
   highly successful

8. Entitling a mentor.
   
   not successful
   highly successful

9. Gaining experience in leadership positions outside the school system.
   
   not successful
   highly successful
10. Obtaining the support of family.
   1 2 3 4 5
   not successful highly successful

   1 2 3 4 5
   not successful highly successful

12. Learning coping skills to deal with conflicting demands of career and family.
   1 2 3 4 5
   not successful highly successful

   1 2 3 4 5
   not successful highly successful

14. Learning the characteristics of the school district in which applying for position.
   1 2 3 4 5
   not successful highly successful

15. Attending workshops to improve professional skills.
   1 2 3 4 5
   not successful highly successful

16. Developing self-confidence in ability to succeed in top level positions.
   1 2 3 4 5
   not successful highly successful

17. Invoking affirmative action and Title IX.
   1 2 3 4 5
   not successful highly successful

18. Being proactive in seeking administrative internships for top level positions.
   1 2 3 4 5
   not successful highly successful

19. Increasing flexibility to relocate.
   1 2 3 4 5
   not successful highly successful

20. Learning how to deal with sex discrimination.
    1 2 3 4 5
    not successful highly successful

21. Improving financial skills.
    1 2 3 4 5
    not successful highly successful
22. Knowing the job description of position for which applying.
   1 2 3 4 5
   not successful  highly successful

23. Learning about hiring practices in district(s) where applying for position.
   1 2 3 4 5
   not successful  highly successful

24. Developing self confidence in public sphere activities such as interacting with community organizations, nurturing contacts, addressing audiences.
   1 2 3 4 5
   not successful  highly successful

25. Requesting to review accreditation reports of schools in the district.
   1 2 3 4 5
   not successful  highly successful

26. Adopting a female role model.
   1 2 3 4 5
   not successful  highly successful

27. Requesting to review minutes of school committee meetings.
   1 2 3 4 5
   not successful  highly successful

28. Developing political "know-how".
   1 2 3 4 5
   not successful  highly successful

29. Learning strategies of successful women in other fields.
   1 2 3 4 5
   not successful  highly successful

Please cite other strategies that you perceive to be successful to women in securing the superintendency:

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your time and effort in completing this survey.
APPENDIX I

ANDERSON QUESTIONNAIRE
**Questionnaire on Perceptions of Barriers and Strategies Impacting on Women Securing the Superintendency**

**I. BIOGRAPHIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION**

Please circle the most appropriate answer.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Age</th>
<th>8. Number of Students in District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Under 25 years</td>
<td>a. Where Employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 25 - 29</td>
<td>b. 1 - 999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 30 - 39</td>
<td>c. 1000 - 2999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 40 - 49</td>
<td>d. 3000 - 4999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. 50 - 59</td>
<td>e. 5000 - 9999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. 60 or over</td>
<td>f. 10,000 - 24,999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Single</td>
<td>a. Rural (under 2,500 pop)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Married</td>
<td>b. Town or small city (2,500 - 9,999 pop)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Widowed</td>
<td>c. Suburb (10,000 - 99,999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Divorced or Separated</td>
<td>d. Urban center or large city (100,000 or more)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Number of Children in School (K-12)</th>
<th>10. Number of Years in Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. 0</td>
<td>a. Less than a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. 1</td>
<td>b. 1 - 4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 2</td>
<td>c. 5 - 8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 3</td>
<td>d. 9 or more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. 4 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Age of Youngest Child

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>11. Longest Superintendency Held</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. no children</td>
<td>a. Less than a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. under 5 years</td>
<td>b. 1 - 4 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. 5 - 12</td>
<td>c. 5 - 8 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. 13 - 19</td>
<td>d. 9 or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Highest Degree Earned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial/Ethnic Origin</th>
<th>12. Number of Superintendencies Held Including Present One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. American Indian/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>a. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>b. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Hispanic</td>
<td>c. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Black, not Hispanic origin</td>
<td>d. 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. White, not Hispanic Origin</td>
<td>e. 5 or more</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Extended family in immediate area?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. yes</td>
<td>a. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. no</td>
<td>b. 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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13. Age at First Superintendency
   a. Under 25 years
   b. 25 - 29
   c. 30 - 39
   d. 40 - 49
   e. 50 - 59
   f. 60 or over

14. List all positions you have held beginning with your first position after teaching.

II. PERCEPTIONS OF BARRIERS

Please circle the number on the scale that best describes your perception of the possible barrier that women must contend with when attempting to secure the superintendency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers</th>
<th>Not a Major Barrier</th>
<th>A Major Barrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Conflicting demands of career and family.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Lack of ability to relocate as a result of personal commitment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. The belief that women do not make good administrators.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Inappropriate career path experiences.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Childhood socialization to “proper” roles for men and women.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The predominance of male candidates for administrative positions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Lack of a mentor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Existence of the “buddy system” in which men refer other men to jobs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Doubt by those in a hiring position of women’s long term career commitment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Lack of self-confidence in ability to succeed in top jobs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Gender bias in the screening and selection process.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Exclusion from informal socialization process of “Good Old Boy Network”.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of acceptance by male administrators and staff.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Lack of acceptance by female administrators and staff.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Lack of political “know-how”.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Lack of motivation to compete for top jobs.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>The belief that women must be better qualified than men in order to attain top level administrative positions.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Lack of a strong women’s network similar to the “Good Old Boy Network.”</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Covert sex discrimination.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Overt sex discrimination.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Potential colleagues’ insubordination in working for a female boss.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please cite other barriers that you perceive to impact on women securing the superintendency.

---

III. PERCEPTION OF STRATEGIES

Please circle the number on the scale that best represents your perception of each strategy as it relates to women securing the superintendency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Increasing visibility in professional circles.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Obtaining a doctorate.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Formulating and adhering to a plan of action to achieve career goals.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Preparing an effective resume.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Utilizing a women’s network similar to the “Good Old Boy Network”.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Enhancing interviewing skills.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Gaining access to community power groups.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Enlisting a mentor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Obtaining the support of family.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Learning coping skills to deal with conflicting demands of career and family.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Developing a strong self-concept.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Learning the characteristics of the school district in which applying for position.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Attending workshops to improve professional skills.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Invoking affirmative action and Title IX.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Being proactive in seeking administrative internships for top level positions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Increasing flexibility to relocate.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Learning how to deal with sex discrimination.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Knowing the job description of position for which applying.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Adopting a female role model.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Developing political “know-how”.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Learning strategies of successful women in other fields.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please cite other strategies that you perceive to be successful to women in securing the superintendency.

Thank you for your time and effort in completing this survey.
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APPENDIX J

DULAC PERMISSION
Dr. Betty J. Dulac,

I am a current doctoral student at Northern Illinois University. I am very interested in the instrument you created for your 1992 study. The instrument entitled, *Questionnaire of Barriers and Strategies Impacting on Women Securing the Superintendency*, appears to be something I can use for my dissertation study. My topic is *Gender Differences in Perceived Barriers of Aspiring Superintendents*. I am interested in surveying both men and women who aspire to a superintendent position to see if there are gender differences in perceived barriers. I would like to receive permission from you to use and adapt your instrument for my study.

I received your contact information from Dr. Veronique Walker who also used your instrument for her dissertation in 2014. I hope it is okay to contact you through the mail since Dr. Walker didn’t have an email address for you. I can create and send you a consent form in order to gain permission to use your instrument if you’d like as well.

Please contact me at your earliest convenience. My email address and office phone number are listed above. My cell number is 815-353-6574 if you would like to discuss my study further. I appreciate your consideration in this matter.

Thank you,
Maureen Cassidy Ed.S.
14/11/15

Dear Maureen,

I was both honored and flattered that you asked to modify my questionnaire. Of course, you may modify it to suit your needs. In fact, I would appreciate your sending me a copy of your findings. Should you need an insert for your dissertation (asking me to modify my questionnaire) I would be most happy to type up a letter for you to include in your own dissertation. Just let me know.

Sincerely,

Betty J. Dular
Permission to use survey instrument
2 messages

Maureen Cassidy <mcassidy@d15.org> Wed, Dec 2, 2015 at 10:16 AM
To: DeeDee-Anderson@utc.edu

Hello Dr. Anderson,

I am a current doctoral student at Northern Illinois University. I am very interested in the instrument you adapted for your 1998 study. The instrument entitled, Questionnaire of Barriers and Strategies Impacting on Women Securing the Superintendency, appears to be something I can use for my dissertation study. My topic is Gender Differences in Perceived Barriers of Aspiring Superintendents. I am interested in surveying both men and women who aspire to a superintendent position to see if there are gender differences in perceived barriers. I would like to receive permission from you to use and adapt your instrument for my study.

I received your contact information from Dr. Veronique Walker who also used your instrument for her dissertation in 2014. I have also sent a letter to Dr. Dulac to receive her permission to use the original instrument as well. I can create and send you a consent form in order to gain permission to use your instrument if you’d like as well.

Please contact me at your earliest convenience. My cell number is 815-353-6574 if you would like to discuss my study further. I appreciate your consideration in this matter.

Thank you,

Maureen Cassidy Ed.S.

---

Ms. Maureen Cassidy Ed.S.
Executive Director of Bilingual Education
McHenry School District 15
815-385-7210

Anderson, Dee Dee <DeeDee-Anderson@utc.edu> Fri, Dec 4, 2015 at 7:54 AM
To: Maureen Cassidy <mcassidy@d15.org>

Maureen,

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/1/?ui=2&ik=61841513e&jvr=kRKK5AhB7d4U.en.&view=pt&q=dee%20DeeDee-Anderson%40utc.edu&sz=true&search... 1/2
APPENDIX L

FEMALE BARRIER RATINGS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>1-Not a Major Barrier</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 – Major Barrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting demands of career and family</td>
<td>15.91%</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
<td>13.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of ability to relocate as a result of personal commitment</td>
<td>22.73%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>13.64%</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td>11.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The belief that women do not make good administrators</td>
<td>65.91%</td>
<td>13.64%</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>11.36%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate career path experiences</td>
<td>58.14%</td>
<td>6.98%</td>
<td>23.26%</td>
<td>9.30%</td>
<td>2.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood socialization to “proper” roles for men and women</td>
<td>65.91%</td>
<td>11.36%</td>
<td>22.73%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The predominance of male candidates for administrative positions</td>
<td>20.45%</td>
<td>22.73%</td>
<td>22.73%</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td>6.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of mentor</td>
<td>29.55%</td>
<td>13.64%</td>
<td>31.82%</td>
<td>20.45%</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of the “buddy system” in which men refer other men to jobs</td>
<td>15.91%</td>
<td>20.45%</td>
<td>22.73%</td>
<td>20.45%</td>
<td>20.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubt by those in a hiring position of women’s long term career commitment</td>
<td>34.09%</td>
<td>20.45%</td>
<td>29.55%</td>
<td>6.82%</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of self confidence in ability to succeed in top jobs</td>
<td>51.16%</td>
<td>11.63%</td>
<td>30.23%</td>
<td>6.98%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender bias in the screening and selection process</td>
<td>20.45%</td>
<td>29.55%</td>
<td>13.64%</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion from informal socialization process of “Good Old Boy” network</td>
<td>15.91%</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>22.73%</td>
<td>20.45%</td>
<td>22.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of acceptance by male administrators and staff</td>
<td>31.82%</td>
<td>15.91%</td>
<td>22.73%</td>
<td>20.45%</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of acceptance by female administrators and staff</td>
<td>34.09%</td>
<td>22.73%</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td>13.64%</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of political “know how”</td>
<td>22.73%</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>34.09%</td>
<td>20.45%</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of motivation to compete for top jobs</td>
<td>47.73%</td>
<td>22.73%</td>
<td>13.64%</td>
<td>13.64%</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The belief that women must be better qualified than men in order to attain top level administrative positions</td>
<td>30.23%</td>
<td>13.95%</td>
<td>27.91%</td>
<td>20.93%</td>
<td>6.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of strong women’s network similar to the “Good Old Boys” network</td>
<td>18.60%</td>
<td>20.93%</td>
<td>18.60%</td>
<td>23.26%</td>
<td>18.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covert sex discrimination</td>
<td>30.23%</td>
<td>25.58%</td>
<td>18.60%</td>
<td>16.28%</td>
<td>9.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overt sex discrimination</td>
<td>46.51%</td>
<td>23.26%</td>
<td>16.28%</td>
<td>9.30%</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential colleagues’ insubordination in working for a female boss</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
<td>20.45%</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td>6.82%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX M

MALE BARRIER RATINGS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>1-Not a Major Barrier</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5-Major Barrier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conflicting demands of career and family</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.44%</td>
<td>19.44%</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of ability to relocate as a result of personal commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>13.89%</td>
<td>27.78%</td>
<td>30.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The belief that women do not make good administrators</td>
<td></td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inappropriate career path experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td>38.89%</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>13.89%</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood socialization to “proper” roles for men and women</td>
<td></td>
<td>61.11%</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The predominance of male candidates for administrative positions</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.43%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>17.14%</td>
<td>5.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of mentor</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>19.44%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existence of the “buddy system” in which men refer other men to jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.22%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>13.89%</td>
<td>19.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubt by those in a hiring position of women’s long term career commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>61.75%</td>
<td>26.47%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of self confidence in ability to succeed in top jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>13.89%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender bias in the screening and selection process</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.78%</td>
<td>27.78%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclusion from informal socialization process of “Good Old Boy” network</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.67%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of acceptance by male administrators and staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>62.88%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>14.89%</td>
<td>2.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of acceptance by female administrators and staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>61.11%</td>
<td>19.44%</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of political “know how”</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>13.89%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>13.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of motivation to compete for top jobs</td>
<td></td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>19.44%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The belief that women must be better qualified than men in order to attain top level administrative positions</td>
<td></td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>13.89%</td>
<td>2.78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of strong women’s network similar to the “Good Old Boys” network</td>
<td></td>
<td>63.89%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>13.89%</td>
<td>13.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covert sex discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td>48.57%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>5.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overt sex discrimination</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>22.86%</td>
<td>17.14%</td>
<td>2.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential colleagues’ insubordination in working for a female boss</td>
<td></td>
<td>69.44%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>2.78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX N

STATISTICAL DATA AND GROUP STATISTICS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender To which gender group do you belong:</td>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13. Conflicting demands on career and family.</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14. Lack of ability to relocate as a result of personal commitment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15. The belief that women do not make good administrators.</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16. Inappropriate career path experiences.</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17. Childhood socialization to &quot;proper&quot; roles for men and women.</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18. The predominance of male candidates for administrative positions.</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19. Lack of a mentor.</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20. Existence of the &quot;buddy system&quot; in which men refer other men to jobs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21. Doubt by those in a hiring position of women's long term career commitment.</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22. Lack of self confidence in ability to succeed in top jobs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23. Gender bias in the screening and selection process.</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24. Exclusion from informal socialization process of &quot;Good Old Boy Network&quot;.</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25. Lack of acceptance by male administrators and staff.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.288</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26. Lack of acceptance by female administrators and staff.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27. Lack of political &quot;know how&quot;.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.210</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28. Lack of motivation to compete for top jobs.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29. The belief that women must be better qualified than men to attain top level administrative positions.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30. Lack of strong women's network similar to the &quot;Good Old Boy Network&quot;.</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31. Covert sex discrimination.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32. Overt sex discrimination.</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.078</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33. Potential colleagues' insubordination in working for female boss.</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1 = Male, 2 = Female
APPENDIX O

MANN-WHITNEY U DATA ANALYSIS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Mann-Whitney U</th>
<th>Wilcoxon W</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q13. Conflicting demands on career and family. -</td>
<td>694.500</td>
<td>1360.500</td>
<td>-.970</td>
<td>.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14. Lack of ability to relocate as a result of personal commitment. -</td>
<td>634.500</td>
<td>1624.500</td>
<td>-1.561</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15. The belief that women do not make good administrators. -</td>
<td>649.000</td>
<td>1315.000</td>
<td>-1.790</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16. Inappropriate career path experiences. -</td>
<td>633.500</td>
<td>1579.500</td>
<td>-1.486</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17. Childhood socialization to &quot;proper&quot; roles for men and women. -</td>
<td>779.000</td>
<td>1769.000</td>
<td>-.147</td>
<td>.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18. The predominance of male candidates for administrative positions. -</td>
<td>478.000</td>
<td>1108.000</td>
<td>-2.979</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19. Lack of a mentor. -</td>
<td>775.000</td>
<td>1441.000</td>
<td>-.170</td>
<td>.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20. Existence of the &quot;buddy system&quot; in which men refer other men to jobs. -</td>
<td>486.500</td>
<td>1152.500</td>
<td>-3.031</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q21. Doubt by those in a hiring position of women's long term career commitment. -</td>
<td>474.500</td>
<td>1069.500</td>
<td>-2.934</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22. Lack of self confidence in ability to succeed in top jobs. -</td>
<td>752.000</td>
<td>1418.000</td>
<td>-.235</td>
<td>.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23. Gender bias in the screening and selection process. -</td>
<td>450.500</td>
<td>1116.500</td>
<td>-3.432</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24. Exclusion from informal socialization process of &quot;Good Old Boy Network&quot;. -</td>
<td>569.500</td>
<td>1235.500</td>
<td>-2.205</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25. Lack of acceptance by male administrators and staff. -</td>
<td>442.000</td>
<td>1072.000</td>
<td>-3.430</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26. Lack of acceptance by female administrators and staff. -</td>
<td>574.000</td>
<td>1240.000</td>
<td>-2.241</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27. Lack of political &quot;know how&quot;. -</td>
<td>709.500</td>
<td>1375.500</td>
<td>-.827</td>
<td>.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28. Lack of motivation to compete for top jobs. -</td>
<td>764.500</td>
<td>1754.500</td>
<td>-.283</td>
<td>.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29. The belief that women must be better qualified than men in order to attain top level administrative positions. -</td>
<td>412.500</td>
<td>1078.500</td>
<td>-3.789</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30. Lack of strong women's network similar to the &quot;Good Old Boy Network&quot;. -</td>
<td>384.500</td>
<td>1050.500</td>
<td>-3.989</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q31. Covert sex discrimination. -</td>
<td>547.500</td>
<td>1177.500</td>
<td>-2.150</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q32. Overt sex discrimination. -</td>
<td>640.000</td>
<td>1270.000</td>
<td>-1.227</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Value 1</td>
<td>Value 2</td>
<td>Value 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q33. Potential colleagues’ insubordination in working for a female boss.</td>
<td>620.000</td>
<td>1286.000</td>
<td>-1.851</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean Rank</td>
<td>Sum of Ranks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Conflicting demands on career and family.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>37.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Lack of ability to relocate as a result of personal commitment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>The belief that women do not make good administrators.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Inappropriate career path experiences.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Childhood socialization to &quot;proper&quot; roles for men and women.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The predominance of male candidates for administrative positions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Lack of a mentor.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Existence of the &quot;buddy system&quot; in which men refer other men to jobs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Doubt by those in a hiring position of women's long term career commitment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ranks**

**Gender - To which gender group do you belong:**

- N
- Mean Rank
- Sum of Ranks
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Tally</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q22. Lack of self confidence in ability to succeed in top jobs. -</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39.39</td>
<td>1418.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40.51</td>
<td>1742.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23. Gender bias in the screening and selection process. -</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31.01</td>
<td>1116.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48.26</td>
<td>2123.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24. Exclusion from informal socialization process of &quot;Good Old Boy Network&quot;. -</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34.32</td>
<td>1235.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45.56</td>
<td>2004.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25. Lack of acceptance by male administrators and staff. -</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30.63</td>
<td>1072.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47.45</td>
<td>2088.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26. Lack of acceptance by female administrators and staff. -</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34.44</td>
<td>1240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45.45</td>
<td>2000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27. Lack of political &quot;know how&quot;. -</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38.21</td>
<td>1375.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42.38</td>
<td>1864.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28. Lack of motivation to compete for top jobs. -</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41.26</td>
<td>1485.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39.88</td>
<td>1754.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29. The belief that women must be better qualified than men in order to attain top level administrative positions. -</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29.96</td>
<td>1078.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48.41</td>
<td>2081.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q30. Lack of strong women's network similar to the &quot;Good Old Boy Network&quot;. -</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29.18</td>
<td>1050.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>49.06</td>
<td>2109.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q31. Covert sex discrimination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.64</td>
<td>44.27</td>
<td>1177.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1903.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q32. Overt sex discrimination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>36.29</td>
<td>42.12</td>
<td>1270.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1811.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q33. Potential colleagues' insubordination in working for a female boss.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.72</td>
<td>44.41</td>
<td>1286.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1954.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1=Male, 2=Female