

**Learning from the Outsider Within:
Five Women's Discourses
Within the Culture of the
High School Principal**

by

Beth A. Hargreaves

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

in the

Educational Leadership

Program

YOUNGSTOWN STATE UNIVERSITY

August, 1995

**Learning from the Outsider Within:
Five Women's Discourses
Within the Culture of the
High School Principal**

Beth Hargreaves

I hereby release this dissertation to the public. I understand this dissertation will be housed at the Circulation Desk of the University library and will be available for public access. I also authorize the University or other individuals to make copies of this dissertation as needed for scholarly research.

Signature:

Beth Hargreaves 7/26/95
Student **Date**

Approvals:

Ray Bee 7/26/95
Dissertation Director **Date**

[Signature] 7/26/95
Committee Member **Date**

Barbara Bullma 7/26/95
Committee Member **Date**

Stephanie A. Jingley 7/26/95
Committee Member **Date**

Peter J. Kanning 7/26/95
Dean of Graduate Studies **Date**

ABSTRACT

This study examines the place of women in the culture of the high school principal. I used feminist analysis as a critique of the positivist paradigm of educational bureaucracy and the masculinist discourse that forms the culture of the high school principal. I used this culture as a microcosm of the larger culture. Through semi-structured interviews with five female high school principals from northern Ohio, I provided an opportunity for them to give voice to their discourses regarding their places in the culture of the high school principal. Through an examination of their discourses, I looked for expression of resistance and acceptance of the masculinized discourse of the culture that they inhabit. I proposed that an interpretation of their discourses can be used to make visible the link between gender and power relations. This visibility will further enable people to re-evaluate their own processes and situations and may provide a forum for multivoiced negotiation of difference and possible emancipatory constructions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS		v
DEDICATION		vii
I. INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW		3
Statement of the Problem		7
Research Question		8
Significance of the Study		8
Delimitations		9
Limitations		12
Definitions of Terms		14
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE		16
Masculinist Organizational Analysis		16
The Culture of the High School Principal		25
The Feminist Case Against Bureaucracy		31
III. METHODOLOGY		51
Feminist Methodology		51
Methodology and Purpose		57
IV. THE FINDINGS: LUCY, FAY, TESS, BETTY, AND SALLY		62
Lucy		63
Fay		76
Tess		83
Betty		93
Sally		98
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS		106
Research Question		107
Research Methodology		107
Concluding Comments		108
Recommendations for Further Study		116
Theory Development and Administrative Practice		118

VI. BIBLIOGRAPHY	121
VII. APPENDIXES	165
Appendix A: Lucy	166
Appendix B: Fay	187
Appendix C: Tess	205
Appendix D: Betty	224
Appendix E: Sally	246
Appendix F: Human Subjects Release	262

I thank my dissertation chair, Dr. Robert Beebe, for his countless readings of this project and his encouragement that I could "get through this thing." Through many hours of discussion, often heated, he offered his continued confidence and high expectations. I have grown to cherish his intellectual and personal friendship. I recognize and thank two other members of my committee, Dr. Howard Pullman and Dr. Stephanie Tingley, for their continued suggestions regarding this study and the good humor that they demonstrated despite my repeated rewrites. I recognize Dr. Glorianne Leck, not only for serving on my committee, but for first awakening me to feminist discourses. I thank her for her intellectual generosity and for being my friend as well as my advisor.

I extend my gratitude to other members of the faculty of Youngstown State University. Robert Fleming, Walter Mayhall, and the other faculty members of the Dana School taught me much more than music. Randy Hoover, Robert Pegues, and other faculty members in the school of education nurtured my ideas. All these people have helped me grow in so many ways.

I would also like to acknowledge the support of the Youngstown Educational Foundation. The Foundation first began funding my educational endeavors in 1971, and, by doing so, provided a young person with more aspirations than money a chance at so much.

It is important to recognize all the members of Doctoral Cohort One who have shared so much with me since we started this program together. I have many memories of each of you. I hope we can all survive this final exercise.

I also thank some of the most important people in my life--my extended family at Champion High School. Both staff and students have taught me so much throughout my tenure there, and they have tolerated, with good humor and affection, the mood swings I've had as I've worked on this project. A special thanks to Bob Sentner, Alice Dueber, and Sharon Armstrong for keeping me laughing and to my associate, Anthony Carsons, Jr., for going to some extra games so that I could have a little additional time for this work.

The typing skills of Tracy and Patty Wolfe deserve my acknowledgment and my thanks. I also need to thank my sister-in-law, Janet Hargreaves, who did most of the interview transcriptions, and my mother, Margueritte McPeck, who "red-eyed" the references.

Thanks go to all the women principals who shared their thoughts with me. They are wonderfully dedicated professionals, and I am proud to be associated with them.

Lastly, I thank my family for loving me and supporting me through all the projects of my life, and, especially, my husband, Kent, for his limitless understanding, good humor, and love. I thank him for "putting his story next to mine" and for journeying with me as I follow the road less traveled.

**To my family,
Margueritte McPeck, Stan Hargreaves,
and the memory of my father, A. Stanley Hargreaves,
for their support of my education
from the very beginning**

**To Elizabeth Hargreaves,
for being my youngest feminist friend**

**And especially,
to my husband,
Kent John Engelhardt,
for every imaginable reason**

**She is a friend of my mind.
She gather me... the pieces I am,
she gather them and give them back to me
in all the right order.
It's good, you know,
when you got a woman who is a friend of your mind.**

Toni Morrison, *Beloved*

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Even though women have numerically dominated in the classroom since the beginning of compulsory education in this country, women are under-represented in positions of educational leadership. A look at the number of females and males in school administration reveals consistent male over-representation in all positions except in the earliest days of the elementary school principalship (Shakeshaft, 1989). This imbalance is especially skewed at the secondary level. In 1985 Jones and Montenegro stated that less than eight percent of secondary principals were female, and by 1990 they had raised the figure to only twelve percent. The American Association of School Administrators reported in 1985 that 8.6 percent of secondary school principalships were held by women, but Shakeshaft (1989) reported only 3.5 percent for the same year. Even reports generated by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission are often uninformative because they do not include all school districts, or do not consistently distinguish between elementary and secondary principals and assistant principals (Yeakey, 1986).

Shakeshaft (1989), a researcher in educational administration, asserts that the absence of accurate data on women administrators is by design and is evidence of a "conspiracy of silence." At best, without accurate data, the status of women administrators remains ambiguous (Pigford, 1993). Based on information from the Ohio Educational Directory for 1993-94, there are approximately 688 high schools in Ohio, yet there are only 49 females heading secondary schools. Because the field is dominated so heavily by men, women administrators in secondary education work in a culture with norms supportive of male behavior. Women in secondary administrative positions are "tokens" not only numerically but in terms of cultural impact (Kanter, 1977).

Comparison of the percentage of secondary administrative positions held by women with the percentage of certificates awarded to women clearly shows that the job pool of qualified women candidates is much greater than the numbers employed. Over 60 percent of the degrees in educational administration awarded each year are to women (U.S. Department of Education, 1994). Yet, women are not hired for administrative positions, even though they hold the appropriate credentials (Pavan, 1985). Because it appears that the

barriers to women's admission into the culture of secondary educational administration do not lie in their certifications, gender may be an excluding factor in the selection process.

Yet, in most research in educational administration, the phenomenon of gender appears to be of no concern (Trujillo, 1983; Peters and Waterman, 1982; Deal and Kennedy, 1982). Consequently, the resulting research framework is derived from the experiences of one gender. This creates a need for feminist research in educational administration.

Feminist research questions the authority of men as the sole authors of cultural texts and meanings and places the social construction of gender at the center of inquiry. Feminist researchers view gender as the basic organizing cultural principle which mediates all the conditions of life. Therefore, central to feminist research is an understanding of gender. Gender refers to socially produced distinctions and patterns of behavior that are characterized as masculine or feminine (Walkerdine, 1994; Weedon, 1987). Gender has also been described as a pervasive symbol of power centered around the subordination of women (Scott, 1986). Feminists view gender not as something someone is, but rather as something that is

experienced by people (West and Zimmerman, 1987). The terms 'man' and 'woman' are defined not as biological descriptions, but as systems of behavioral expectations. Thus, gender is often symbolic of cultural experiences. Articulating and naming those experiences brings the subject of gender more fully to consciousness.

Feminists evaluate gender by focusing on it as a social relation and examine the processes that magnify its significance. The key ideological goal of feminist research methodologies is to correct both the invisibility and the distortion of the female's experience of gender in ways relevant to ending women's unequal position. Feminist critiques rethink and deconstruct "master" narratives within a culture, especially gender constructs (Luke, 1989). Master narratives refer to overarching philosophies of history such as the Enlightenment construct of the steady progress of reason. Feminist critiques advocate the de-centering of master narratives with new forms of discourse and alternate narratives.

The culture of educational administration is centered around the constitutive meanings and practices connected with the field (Sotirin, 1987). Professional cultures are based on what is said (discourse) and done (practice) in their name and include tasks, research, and

associated values (Cherryholmes, 1988). Feminist research in education involves deconstructing the common practices and discourses within all patriarchal cultures because only then can they become revised. Smircich (1985) stated, "For us to see...in cultural terms is to understand...within a wider pattern of significance" (p. 66).

Statement of the Problem

My research proposed a wider understanding of secondary school administration as practiced by women through an examination of the language and stories as told by the women administrators themselves. Smircich (1985) stated, "An important and necessary aspect of a cultural paradigm for...analysis is the addition of a feminist voice to the discussion..." (p. 67). Breaking the silence of women's voices within the dominant discourse of secondary educational administration may give voice to alternative perspectives and provide a forum for possible emancipatory practices. Foucault (1972), a French philosopher, called the emergence of a specifically feminist discourse "an insurrection of subjugated knowledges."

Shakeshaft (1989) pointed out that "the misogyny of the male world makes women's lives in administration different from men's"

(p. 52). Research indicates that secondary school administrative culture fails to acknowledge or consider women's experience and the possible revolutionary potential of feminist perspectives (Shakeshaft, 1987, 1989; Schmuck, 1981). Some authors have written of the overvaluing of the masculine in management and leadership (Gray, 1982; Heller, 1982; Schaef, 1981). Studies of gender differences in leadership have been a relatively recent phenomenon (Shakeshaft, 1986; Luke, 1989).

Research Question

This research examined the interpretations of behaviors are embedded in women's discourse in the culture of secondary educational administration. The basic research question was, "What does women's discourse reveal about the modes of resistance and acceptance used by women in negotiating their place within the culture of the high school principal?"

Significance of the Study

This study is practical even though some practitioners may question it for wearing a theoretical badge. Practices within education that limit full representation of differing persons and interests challenge the notion of pluralistic educational values and

limit their possible development. Fine (1993) states that one aim of feminist research may be to identify limitations of representation in a culture and to contribute to the understanding and development of alternative discourses. Underlying that aim is the belief that multiple discourses can provide greater insight than can any single authoritative position. Cherryholmes (1988) stated that feminist research "creates spaces where debate over power and the production of knowledge could be held through its cogent argument that the exclusion of women from the knowledge base brings into question that which has passed for wisdom" (p. 75).

The importance of this study is threefold. First, the marginality of women in positions in secondary administration imitates the pattern of the larger culture and examination of this marginality may call attention to women's resistance and acceptance in many contexts. Second, the study offers to provide increased awareness of the perception and evaluation of gender differences in secondary educational administration. Third, the study promotes an alternative discourse that may support the development of a pluralistic identity for educational leadership.

Delimitations

With notable exceptions (Edson, 1988; Funk, 1988; Pavan, 1991) most studies of gender differences in school administration have been conducted by means of mailed questionnaires. Little information has been obtained from interviews in which women were asked to reflect about their experiences. Moreover, while some scholarly research has investigated organizational and leadership cultures from a gendered perspective (Marshall and Mitchell, 1989; Sotirin, 1987), there are few such studies that have examined secondary educational administration.

I interviewed five female high school principals in Ohio from the total population of 49 head principals. The research was limited only to head principals, not women who served as assistant or vice principals. Determinations regarding sex were made by identifying principals with traditional female names. The sample was drawn from the population identified in the Ohio Educational Directory for 1993-94. The selection included representation from as wide a demographic variation as possible.

This project was feminist in design. Feminists view knowledge as created through "personal and concrete interactions...and as

personal, concrete, particularistic, and contextual" (Agger in Kontos, 1975). Ferguson (1984) viewed feminist discourse as "made by each individual from the precarious and changed point of view of personal experience" (p. 179). The following view was advanced by Christiansen-Ruffman (1989):

Intellectual thought stems partly from personal experience and partly from working with the language, logics of argument, and systems of relevance that are part of our society and scholarly discipline. Personal experiences are often rendered invisible, however, as human understanding is transformed into "objective science." Intellectual and theoretical development in the social sciences has suffered from glorification of abstractions, from false claims to objectivity, and from depersonalization. (p. 124)

Feminist research methods embrace the personal as a legitimate way of knowing (Belenky et al., 1986; Gilligan, 1982). Feminists do not maintain the traditional stance that scholarship is neutral and that its

product is objective knowledge. In feminist critiques, traditional educational research is viewed as part of the privileged dominant discourse. This traditional stance conceals the arbitrariness of organizing rules and prevents deconstruction of fundamental concepts such as power, authority, and legitimacy (Balsamo, 1985).

Tetreault (1984) traced four historical stages of feminist organizational research. The first generation of studies asked if women were competent to fill administrative roles. The second examined the question of female willingness to accept administrative positions. The third generation of research questioned whether or not organizations discriminated against women. The latest research examines gender-related omissions within organizational culture. My study falls into the last stage.

Questions from the previous stages of research viewed the culture of schools as bureaucracies capable of technical perfectibility with the help of scientific administration (Callahan, 1967; Tyack and Hansot, 1982). The new research reexamines the administrative culture by asking about preferred values and behavior. The feminist form of this research questions why the voices of women are not heard within the culture of secondary school administration.

Limitations

It is not possible to be a detached researcher, to understand voices without the insertion of self. Using language means attaching one's own meanings, and this creates a privilege by the researcher that invades all research relationships. The questions asked, as well as the meanings assigned, were determined by my own positioning as a woman high school principal within the discourse which framed this study. By focusing on discourse rather than on truth, and by recognizing my own inextricable involvement in the process of creating meaning, I did not expect to free myself, to achieve transcendence, or to presume that through self-reflection I could disengage myself from my research. I am a woman high school principal. As Smith (1990) pointed out, researchers exist on the same plane as those who speak with them. I am inextricably involved in the discourses which shape women in the culture of the high school principal. While I have attempted to explain others' words through my own, I have been keenly aware of my own interaction with my findings. My own discourse impacts on the meanings that I create.

Moreover, it was not my intent to create normative data for the purpose of prediction or control. Instead, this study produced

a body of discourse that may lead others to develop interpretations and understandings that are meaningful to them.

Definition of Terms

The term 'gender' refers to a set of socially produced distinctions and patterns of behavior that are characterized as masculine or feminine. These assumptions are manifest in a number of ideas and practices which influence the identity, social opportunities and life experiences of human actors (Mills, 1988, p. 352).

The term 'culture' refers to a pattern of assumptions and behaviors that are invented, discovered, or developed by a group as it learns to cope with its problems of adaptation and integration. Cultural assumptions are believed to have worked well enough to be considered valid and are taught to new members of the group as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel (Schein, 1990). Reflections of the organization's culture are observed behavioral regularities, group norms, organizational philosophy, and climate (Schein, 1985).

Concluding Comments

In this chapter, I have identified feminist discourse in the culture of the high school principal as the area of research for my study. I have identified the need for feminist research as a possible

way to deconstruct present practice and provide voice to alternate discourse in this culture. The inclusion of feminist voices to the discourse may enable practitioners to learn from women in their marginalized position as outsiders within the culture of the high school principal.

In the next chapter, through an examination of the works of others, I will present educational bureaucracy as a part of the dominant masculinist discourse in the culture of the high school principal. I will then propose a feminist critique of positivist organizational analysis and educational bureaucracy as an alternate discourse to current practices.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter has three objectives. The first is to examine the theoretical dimensions of organizational and leadership analysis especially as they pertain to educational organizations. Modern organizational and leadership structures will be presented as characteristic of masculinist models. The second objective is to present the culture of the high school principal as a masculinist enterprise (Reiger, 1989; Blackmore, 1989). After this review of the construction of bureaucracy as the "scientific organization of inequality," (Ferguson, 1984, p. 8) the chapter will present a feminist critique of educational bureaucracy as an alternative discourse to current practices that marginalize women within that culture.

Masculinist Organizational Analysis

The bulk of organizational analysis is positivist. Griffiths (1983) noted, "At the present time, the writers of the popular textbooks in educational administration use a strictly positivist definition of theory" (p. 216). Griffiths noted some exceptions, including Weick (1979) and Pfeffer (1982), but he observed that the bulk of the

training material for educational administrators is built upon the positivist paradigm.

Both Pfeffer (1982) and Burrell and Morgan (1979) conducted comprehensive critical reviews of organizational theory and research that characterized the present state of organizational theory as positivist. Pfeffer (1982) described the organizational literature as dominated by "the element of conscious, foresightful action reasonably autonomously constructed to achieve some goal or value" (p. 78). Burrell and Morgan (1979) stated that "the dominant perspective within the field of organization studies is characterized by a close and interactive relationship between social system theory and objectivism" (p. 123).

According to Guba (1985) the following concepts constitute positivism: (1) there is a single tangible reality; (2) the inquirer is able to maintain a discrete distance from the object of inquiry, neither disturbing it nor being disturbed by it; (3) the aim of inquiry is to develop a nomothetic body of knowledge encapsulated in truth statements independent of time and context; (4) every action can be explained as the effect of a cause; and (5) inquiry is value-free.

In positivism, theoretical adequacy is achieved through objectivity and universalism. Objectivity is "the inquiry's independence from the subjective values, interests and emotions of those who engage in...inquiry" (Jagger, 1983, p. 355). Jagger noted, "The aim of these methodological constraints is ultimately the same, to provide justification for the claim that the theories produced by these methods are not biased" (pp. 377-378). Because positivist methods supposedly do not present the viewpoint of any particular group, these methods supposedly achieve the goals of universalism as "conclusions that are universally applicable and as embodying universal or human values" (pp. 377-378). In positivism, knowledge is value-free and is not marked by power or ideology. Knowledge is presumed to be the achievement of rational individuals who are not the product of particular social relations.

Positivist organizational analysis began with the work of Weber (Balogh, 1990). Weber's bureaucracy rested on rational grounds. That is, "a belief in the 'legality' of patterns of normative rules and the right of those elevated to authority under such rules to issue commands" (Parsons, 1947, p. 328). Weber's writings defined the characteristics of bureaucracy, which included a hierarchy of

controls, a division of labor, and detailed rules and regulations. Weber's work fits the search for order, rationality, and scientific legitimacy that characterizes the present social and behavioral science community in the United States. His work also supports the faith that the problems of humankind are able to be solved through the process of research by social scientists. While granting the difficulty of attaining excellence in bureaucratic performance, Weber's view was that divergence from the ideal bureaucratic type was irrational and interfered with organizational efficiency.

Through historical research Weber developed the belief that rational examination and organization of conduct could transform the organizational world into a world dominated by the logic of the machine (Bates, 1989). The logic of the machine, as constructed through an organization based on power and hierarchy, became Weber's dominating logic of organization. Weber noted that the bureaucratic form routinized the process of administration exactly as the machine routinized production. Found in Weber's work (1947) is the first comprehensive definition of organization that emphasizes precision, speed, clarity, regularity, and efficiency through detailed rules and regulations. Weber's work is so pervasive that nearly all

organizations are structured around some type of bureaucracy (Clegg, 1979).

Bureaucratic discourse claims political neutrality. By claiming to be a non-ideological instrument for efficiency, bureaucracy renders itself "ideologically invisible" (Roszak, 1969, p. 8). The official version of reality offered by bureaucracies presumes a logic built on axiomatic theories.

Greenfield (1971) recognized that, within a Weberian view, administrators are presented as carriers of rationality and initiative, while other actors appear as objects of managerial action (1986). As Marcuse (1971) observed, "the main basis of this rationality is abstraction[,...]the reduction of quality to quantity" (p. 136). The qualities of the person are disregarded in favor of quantification. Habermas (1972), a German philosopher, pointed out that Weber's rationality was located in the social, political, and economic organizations characteristic of the modern state, and that the result of bureaucracy was the substitution of a rational world of coercion for the liberated world of individual action. Weber (1947) stated:

Bureaucratization offers above all the optimum possibility for carrying through the principle of specializing administrative functions according to purely objective considerations....The "objective" discharge of business primarily means a discharge of business according to calculable rules and without regard for persons (p. 215).

Weber's bureaucracy "...develops the more perfectly, the more it is dehumanized, the more completely it succeeds in eliminating from official business, love, hatred, and all personal, irrational and emotional elements which escape calculation" (p. 975). In bureaucracy, individuals become identified only with their organizational roles (Ferguson, 1984).

Second-generation organizational theories produced a new concern about the human and informal aspects of organizations, but these theories were still framed by the view of the individual as the universal male (Blackmore, 1992). Embedded in organizational theory and administrative structures, masculinist discourses are dominant, as are particular gendered images. Second-generation administrative

literature from this period identified the "rational bureaucrat," "organizational man," and "corporate man" (Wolcott, 1973; Whyte, 1956; Kohn, 1971).

Situational or contingency theories still maintained the positivist frame but stated that there are administrative skills and behaviors ranging from democratic to authoritarian which can be learned and selected for use in certain contexts (Clark, 1985). These theories proposed that, with training, administrators can learn to expand their range of styles and become effective under varying conditions. This research sought to identify patterns of administrative behavior and to establish the situations under which each style was most effective. No specific administrative behavior was given preference except as a means to achieve a particular organizational end most efficiently (Clark, 1985). The goal, however, remained the creation of a perfectly rational organizational form. The Weberian model remained unquestioned (Bologh, 1990).

Most contemporary writings on organizational theory still refer explicitly to the theory of bureaucracy as defined by Weber. Weber's paradigm for leadership within a bureaucracy has been modified and additional variables have been studied with greater sophistication in

their methods of measurement. While this has caused the field of leadership study to become more practically and scientifically heuristic, the theory's basic tenets continue largely unchallenged. Researchers have added sophistication, clarity, comprehensiveness, and validity to the basic construct without abandoning or replacing the construct itself. The structure has been built up and modified, but its essential assumptions still govern the dominant discourse for administrators within organizations and the training programs for educational administrators in universities. Weber's bureaucracy remains "the major ways through which hierarchical relationships of power and authority are erected and maintained" (Britan & Cohen, 1980, p. 2).

Organizational leadership and management theories make Weber's naturalistic, scientific, and behavioristic bias dominant by the acceptance of his theory's tenets (Greenfield, 1975). A fundamental assumption underlying such theories is that once administrative science has discovered the rules, then the knowledge developed from these rules can be used to control the organizational environment. The basic orientation is toward control (Clark, 1985). These theories seek to identify how to manage and/or manipulate the people in an

organization toward the most efficient means of reaching pre-specified ends. Moreover, the supposed objectivity of positivistic management theory separates means from ends and facts from values. (Blackmore, 1992). Decision making is attributed to the position and not the individual, thus absolving individuals from moral and ethical responsibility (Bates, 1988). The decision-making process becomes "vague and impersonal, the instrument of an anonymous, fragmented intelligence" (Prethus, 1978, p. 55).

Because positivist administrative analysis is a field of study dominated by Weber, the traditional conceptualization of leadership is bound by a hierarchical, authority-heavy conceptual structure, and the disciplines of leadership are generally devoted to the scientific improvement of the functioning of organizations (Bologh, 1990; Ferguson, 1984). One of the fundamental assumptions of positivism is that under similar conditions similar events will yield similar results, yet positivism has failed to produce definitions of precise inter-relationships regarding leadership behavior in administration (Clark, 1985). There are no axiomatic theories that predict the reproduction of leadership wherever desired.

In research and theory development concerning both educational and organizational analysis, positivism has had a continued privileging. Truth has developed into a procedure determined by objectified methods with controlled values. Researchers have had privileged access to meaning. Their meanings have restricted alternate discourse. The heritage of the assumptions in this work is an impediment burdening the field of organizational theory and practice (Clark, 1985). The power of positivism has built bureaucracy into an ideological iron cage (Bates, 1988).

The Culture of the High School Principal

Since the development of contingency theories of administrative leadership, the role of situational moderators has been seen to impact on the acts called "leadership." Culture is a great moderator (Marshall, 1993). Burger and Luckmann (1967) viewed all cultural structures as "created through images and the symbolic order...[and]... expressing the commitments of the past, institutionalized in power arrangements, and persisting into the present by affecting people's behavior" (p. 334). These cultural structures provide a patterned system of knowledge and conceptualization (Bullivant, 1981). Administrative work is culturally

formed. Cultural structures provide the thought patterns by which high school principals interpret reality.

There is a dominant cultural system of discourse related to various social categories, including individual occupation, academic credentials, race, gender, religion, and sexual orientation (Brown, 1993). Individuals use the meanings given to them by the dominant cultural system to interpret their interactions with others, often without conscious awareness (Brown, 1993). However, individuals may develop discourses that reject the dominant social norms and expectations (Brown, 1993). My study proposes that discourses are a combination of acceptance and resistance.

Pringle (1990) stated that "all discourses are produced from, and themselves occupy, sexually coded positions" (p. 180). As Jagger (1983) pointed out, what passes for knowledge within a culture is the representation of the dominant group's interest. Lather (1991) stated that "positionality weighs heavily on what knowledge comes to count as legitimate" (p. 116). The knowledge that shapes and sustains behavior in a culture is the knowledge developed by those in positions of power within the prevailing order. Burger and Luckman (1967) stated, "People's behavior, so structured and constrained, recreates

the structure that, in turn, guides thought. Exactly so is culture created, and so does it shape the process of its subsequent recreation" (p. 334). This makes reshaping the culture difficult. "The extent that the insights of the culture...controls rather than expresses...may thus prove quite...totalitarian in its influence" (Morgan, 1986, pp. 138-39). Those in positions of privilege granted by the status quo may marginalize ways of giving meaning to experience which redefine cultural gender norms and enable the maintenance of the dominant discourse of the culture. In the case of the high school principalship, this dominant discourse would be masculinist. Existing norms must be constantly reaffirmed as part of the large body of common-sense knowledge upon which individuals draw for their understanding.

Presthus (1978) observed that we live in an organizational society because organizations are likely to influence almost everything. People build their lives around distinct concepts of work and leisure, follow rigid routines five or six days a week, live in one place and work in another, wear certain clothes, and defer to authority. This is all a result of how organizational culture influences our lives. People in organizations, as in social life generally,

generate knowledge that tells them what is, how it got that way, and what ought to be (Blackmore, 1989). Such knowledge forms the substance of organizational cultures. People learn these basic patterns of assumptions that make up organizational culture (Sergiovanni et al., 1992).

Because the culture of the high school principal is dominated by masculine discourse, this discourse becomes the common sense knowledge within the culture (Bates, 1984; Blackmore, 1989; Noddings, 1994). It is the "general direction imposed...by the dominant group" (Gramsci, 1971, p. 12). This discourse impacts on women situated in this culture because it is their voice which is marginalized. The common-sense beliefs reproduce gender relations in school and bureaucracy (Hearn and Parkin, 1983). Embedded in this culture are images and languages that exclude the perspective of women or assume that women's perspectives are the same as men's. The discourse of women cannot be discovered without reflection because "women's perceptions of reality are distorted both by male dominant ideology and by the male dominated structure of everyday life" (Jaggar, 1983). This view is supported by Bates (1984) who observed that school administration mirrors and reinforces the

patterns of dominance and subordination found in the wider society. Those who do not adopt the masculinist discourse risk being marginalized or being labeled dysfunctional. Women high school principals can provide a different voice, but frequently do not. This is dictated by the sway of masculine discourse as the dominant voice within the culture.

Within the educational literature, examination of the culture of the high school principal is sparse and is largely limited to the feminist critique (Marshall, 1985; Noddings, 1994). This is because the "common-sense" of the male culture is not reflected upon by men. The situation is so acceptable and so normal that it is taken for granted and not discussed (Oseen, 1993).

Marshall (1985) interviewed twenty-five women school administrators and identified three stages in their career development. The first stage was termed the "Culturally Defined Stage," in which the women mold their identities, attitudes, and choices according to societal expectations. Marshall labeled the second stage of career development as "Transition," during which women find ways to balance, integrate, and discard ineffective roles. During this time, women face female career-role strain and find

access to a male gender-typed career. The last stage identified by Marshall is the "Self-Defined Stage," in which the female administrator adjusts roles, builds substitutes for role expectations she cannot fulfill, and adjusts to the discomfort that she feels with "games-playing" within a male gender-typed career. In this last stage, the female administrator becomes acculturated into educational administration. Marshall's critique stated that women need to be socialized into the culture of educational administration in order to be "successful" within the culture.

Educational leadership is culturally formed (Marshall, 1989). The culture of the high school principal is not "the coherent, authentic source of the interpretation of the meaning of reality" because experience and reality are not fixed (Weedon, 1987, p. 8). Knowledge of the culture is not based on unmediated experience of the culture simply revealed through transparent language, but is governed by gender and power relations. Relations of gender, of power, and of knowledge construct people as cultural subjects. This is an alternative to the positivist perspective of organizational leadership which places emphasis on reality as socially constructed through the interaction of individuals (Mumby, 1988). Administrators are socially

situated actors who are caught up in power relations of gender that are not arbitrary, but are historically constituted and may not be entirely understood by them (Bates, 1984).

Women must construct leadership without access to its dominant discourse. It is the purpose of this study to recognize the voices of women in the culture of high school educational administration, with attention given to their specificity as women and their differences from men. This study examines how women construct their own strategies, modes of behavior, and perspectives. The specific topic of interest is how strategies of discourse position and create women in the culture of the high school principal.

The Feminist Critique of Educational Bureaucracy

The usual approach of the positivist paradigm is to neglect gender completely (Hearn and Parkin, 1983). Most organizational studies have been gender blind or, what O'Brien (1981) has termed, in the "male-stream" (p. 5). Texts about organizations turn out to be discussions of men, men's behavior, and masculinity (Hearn and Parkin, 1987). Traditional knowledge in such organizational literature assumes that what organizations are and what happens in them are "free of, uninformed by, and unshaped by" gender relations (Morrison,

1992, p. 4). There are few references to gender in standard textbooks or readers on organization. Little has been written about how women and men might construct "organizational reality through interpretation and interaction in relation to gender and sexuality," although what has been written indicates that "women and men experience organizational life differently" (Sheppard, 1990, p. 141).

Gender issues are important in the everyday lives of both men and women. Gender constructs affect every aspect of life, from the ways that infants are treated, to the actions of the educational system, to adult working conditions. Yet, scholars in organizational theory have made the assumption that scientific knowledge as gained through empirical studies is objective and positivist and can be generalized across situations and gender. This assumption is blind to the different structural positions men and women often occupy. As Weick (1979) suggested, positivist organizational analysis has limitations because "rationality is best understood as in the eye of the beholder" (p. 21). Rationality is bounded by the individual's perceptual and information processing limitations, and these limitations are tied to the present power relationships between men and women.

Positivist views assume organizational analysis to be neutral with respect to gender voices, but such views assume that it is possible for women to completely suspend any reference to their own social histories (Rizvi, 1993). However, as Martin and Mohanty (1986) stated, "The claim to a lack of identity or positionality is itself based on privilege, on the refusal to accept responsibility for one's implication in actual historical and social relations, or a denial that personalities exist or that they matter, the denial of one's own personal history and the claim to a total separation from it" (p. 208). The myth of bureaucratic rationality has dominated the study of organizations and, by so doing, has been a powerful ideological resource for maintaining particular gendered relationships (Martin, 1987). Ferguson (1984) called this "the scientific organization of inequality" (p. 8). As Kanter (1975) stated, the formal structure of organizations embody a "masculine ethic of rationality." The masculinist position embraces objective truth and refuses to endorse the possibility of a politics of truth (Weedon, 1987). Possession of 'the facts' is a dominant and restrictive mode of power (Hearn and Parkin, 1987).

American school administrators have been responsive to

positivist bureaucratic ideology. The view of educational leadership as bureaucratic rationality, supported by positivist theories of knowledge which assume and privilege universal laws of administration, has become dominant (Grundy, 1987). Positivist bureaucratic principles have been incorporated into the organizational practices of the educational system. School organizations have leaned heavily on the use of general rules to control the behavior of all members of the organization. Authority for making and using these rules has been supported by rational considerations. This allows schools to operate in a spirit of "formalistic impersonality" (Abbott, 1965, p. 45).

The school organization has developed a clearly defined Weberian hierarchy of authority, even though the term 'hierarchy' is not commonly used. In schools there is, however, overall acceptance and implementation of the principle of superordinate and subordinate relations which follows the assumption "that the superior, at any point in the hierarchy is able to tell his subordinates what to do, and to guide them in doing it" (Thompson, 1961, p. 75). For example, principals are presently regarded as instructional leaders who should tell teachers how to teach. This type of masculinist enterprise is

privileged by the structure of bureaucracy which parallels the patriarchal family.

In keeping with the positivist paradigm, popular research has developed around the concept of making women like men in order to correct their perceived deficiencies for upward mobility in the organization. Many books have been written to help women get management positions and succeed in a 'man's world.' These books all share a focus on women, although they did not adopt a feminist perspective. Such books include: Games Mother Never Taught You by Harragan (1977) and The Managerial Woman by Hennig and Jardin (1976). Women were required "to bend over backward to assimilate themselves into the majority culture" (Schmuck, 1987, p. 15). The advice in these books urged women away from any display of individualism. "Remember that the more you differ from the norm...the more you'll have to show that you accept the group values" (Harragan, 1977, p. 23).

Schmuck (1987) identified four historical research periods dealing with the place of females in educational organizational analysis. Nothing was written on organizational analysis from a female perspective until the mid-1970s. Schmuck called research

prior to this time "exclusionary" or "androcentric," meaning that men were both the objects and the subjects of study (p. 6).

One of the earliest writers about the role of women in organizations was Kanter (1975). Kanter asked vital questions about the impact of organizational structure upon female opportunity within the organization and the sense of self that developed for women as a result. Kanter focused on the structural causes of gender inequity within organizations and called for an analysis which would bring that inequity to light. Kanter viewed women in management roles as outsiders or "tokens". According to Kanter (1977), tokens are not seen as they are and must fight stereotypes. Moreover, Kanter proposed that tokens must choose between trying to limit their visibility and taking advantage of their visibility and in doing so risk being labeled troublemakers. Kanter noted that stereotyped assumptions can marginalize tokens so that they play limited and constrained roles within the organization.

Schmuck described Kanter as a compensatory thinker in women's research. Kanter included women in organizational analysis but only within the traditional modes of inquiry which still perceived men as the norm. Schmuck (1987) labeled this the "just add women

and stir" approach (p. 13). This approach did not adequately account for the role of women in traditional organizational structure. Women were sometimes mentioned, but no notice was given to gender or feminist theories.

Schmuck indicated that some early gender research attempted to explain gender inequity through psychological differences between men and women. Women were viewed by some researchers as deficient because of their different socialization from men. Other research demonstrated that there was no psychological difference between men and women for the purposes of organizational structure.

The next stage in research on females in organizations that Schmuck identified was the "systems thinking" stage, which identified women as oppressed through institutional structure. She identified the following organizational constraints on women's mobility: recruitment of males, male mentoring, lack of female role models, and unfair hiring practices. Wolff (1977) was an example of a theorist who identified the oppression of women by systems thinking. Wolff (1977) observed that organizational theory cannot

account for differential treatment of the genders without evaluating the oppression of women in society.

Schmuck (1987) labeled contemporary feminist research in organizations as "the new scholarship" (p. 18). Feminist critiques seek to end the silence of women and develop a new language to name and render women's experiences visible (Rich, 1985).

Marshall (1985) identified stages of female organizational research similar to those identified by Schmuck. Marshall's stages are identified by the questions that each research period sought to answer. The first stage of research asked, "Are women discriminated against? How?" The second stage focused on differences between men and women. It asked, "What is different about women that makes them less likely to become administrators?" The next stage of research asked, "How do female socialization and cultural stereotypes affect women's entry into educational administration?" The latest stage of research asked, "What organizational processes hinder women?" There are obvious parallels between these stages and those developed by Schmuck.

The works of Schmuck, Kanter, and Marshall are important because they acknowledged the place of women in organizational

theory; however, these women did not use gender to frame new organizational perspectives. Their theories were more concerned with placing females into the same positions of power as accorded to males in a bureaucracy. Feminist critiques have been directed not only against the distribution of females and males throughout organizations but also against the very structure of bureaucracy. Feminist critiques do not seek to develop matriarchy as a rival account from patriarchy, but rather, they seek "effective forms of intervention into systems of power in order to replace them with systems that are preferable" (Gross, 1986, p. 196).

In order to examine genderized power relations, it may be helpful to examine cultural assumptions of feminine or masculine. Because of the traditional location of each of the sexes in our culture, the public sphere has been essentialized to be masculine and the private sphere has been essentialized to be feminine (Reiger, 1989). Masculinity has been essentialized as rational, analytical, achievement-oriented, problem-solving, independent, self-reliant, and resourceful (Hearn and Parkin, 1987). These are also terms which have defined traditional organizational and leadership theories as they have developed from the Weberian model.

In positivist approaches to administrative leadership, the masculinist characterization is common. Historical accounts of 'great men' substantiate that the behaviors, traits, and characteristics displayed by men in formal positions of authority have become the givens of leadership. Schein, in an article entitled "Think manager - think male" (1976), reported a large and statistically significant resemblance between linguistic descriptors of "men" and "managers" and a near zero correlation between "women" and "managers". Thus, the model of successful behavior for public life and for our leaders has been documented to be essentialized as masculine (Schein, 1976; Bennis, 1989). Therefore, leadership in organizations has been historically associated with particular characteristics, such as aggressiveness, competitiveness, and independence, which are more frequently depicted as masculine.

Thus, the perception is that men's gender and leadership roles are coterminous, while women experience a contradiction in being both feminine and leader. The dominant model of scientific educational administration is built upon conceptions of human behavior and knowledge which exclude women's knowledge and experiences, justify administration as men's work, and assume men's

experience as universal (Blackmore, 1989). Sheppard (1989) recognized that this produces a range of responses termed "strategies of gender management" through which women attempt to stay "feminine enough" so as not to challenge prevailing sex role conventions and "businesslike enough" so as to be seen as credible leaders as defined by the masculine paradigm.

Feminist writers have been critical of essentializing tendencies by automatically attaching a particular behavior characteristic to a particular biological sex. When authority is placed in juxtaposition to nurturance in feminist theory, feminists view this as a gender construct, not a biological one. The essentialization of traits into biology limits the way women can practice administrative leadership as defined by the Weberian model. "In our culture, the role of nurturer and intellectual have been separated not just by gender, but by function; to try to recombine them is to create confusion" (Culley and Portuges, 1985, p. 13). In this view, any kind of authority is seen to be "incompatible with the feminine" (Friedman, 1985, p. 206).

Shakeshaft (1981) reviewed all the dissertations that were written between 1973-79 with women in educational administration as their main topic. She found that even though most of these

studies were written by women, they emerged from a framework that was primarily male-defined. She stated, "The research presents men and the masculine model as the norm and women and the feminine model as a deviation from the norm" (p. 24). This conclusion is shared by Heller (1982) who noted that despite the ideologies of education that support feminine, non-authoritarian, and humanistic leadership behaviors, examples of positivistic male leadership are still the norm in educational organizations. Heller found that such stereotypes of women in leadership roles existed as the "iron maiden" or the "mother, pet."

Most of the research on women's management and leadership is conducted from the same functionalist and positivist approach that has primarily guided the traditional, masculine models of organization (Kanter, 1976; Neville, 1988). Overall, this research has found women's leadership style to be less hierarchical and more democratic than that of men. Women tend to use power in the service of others, thereby increasing the other person's resources, capabilities, and ability to act (Miller, 1986). Shakeshaft (1987) stated that building community is an essential part of the women leader's style. "Women

exhibit a more democratic, participatory style that encourages inclusiveness rather than exclusiveness in schools" (p. 4).

In a study conducted by Ozga (1993), women educational leaders are given credit for being more flexible and sensitive than men. Pitner (1985) conducted a detailed study of the leadership styles of male and female school superintendents in the United States. She found that women spent less time on deskwork, visited more classrooms, kept more up-to-date on curricular issues, spent more time with their peers, and mentored others more than men. Their language was more hesitant and tentative, their agendas were more informal and flexible, and there was less distance from subordinates than was the case with men counterparts. Women superintendents also placed greater emphasis on cohesiveness, favored more group activities, coped more readily with stress, engaged less frequently in displays of anger as control mechanisms, were less individualistic, defused conflict more easily, and spent more time fostering integrative culture and climate than men in the same role. While this type of research recognized differences in style between men and women, it did not focus on social control, hierarchy, or bureaucracy.

Loden (1985) suggested that there is a feminine leadership model can be adopted by either males or females. A feminine leader prefers an operating style that is cooperative, an organizational structure that emphasizes teams, and a problem solving style that combines the intuitive and the rational. Loden stated that such leadership differs from the traditional masculine model in its reliance on the emotional as well as rational. This type of analysis attempts to replace hierarchical approaches and views organizations as "information based organizations" which cannot work until the hierarchical bureaucracy is changed to a "centra-archical structure" (Jardim and Hennig, 1990, p. 128). Within this type of structure, leaders treat others as equals and favor a collaborative approach to work.

Fullian (1991) stated that when female principals are considered as a group, studies show that women are more likely to possess characteristics associated with effective leadership and effective schooling, as Fullian defined the concepts. However, it is important to remember that reported differences between women and men can be seen as differences in gender-related characteristics, not necessarily differences in biological sex.

Lightfoot (1983) explored six schools and attempted to identify what made each school "good." Her conclusion was that what was "feminine" in leadership led to good schools. All of the principals in Lightfoot's study were male, but these leaders showed the nurturance that has been labeled "feminine." In these schools, there was an attention given to process that led to a sharing of power. There was an emphasis on relationships. Lastly, there was a feeling of liberation in these schools.

Fullian (1991), Loden (1985), and Lightfoot (1983) defined feminist leadership style in contrast to masculinist models. In these studies femininity was viewed as the antithesis of traditional positivist organizational and leadership expectations (Forisha, 1978). In these studies, the emphasis was placed on the differences in leadership style between women and men and the effect of those differences on the organization.

Looking at women in administrative positions merely in a context of leadership style overlooks the cultural structure of work in a bureaucracy. Feminist discourses do not seek merely to include women as objects in the patriarchal discourse, in which sameness is emphasized rather than difference, but they advocate the

reconstruction of the concept of organization and leadership at the most basic level. Feminist critique puts gender at the center of inquiry, and advocates an alternative discourse to masculinist bureaucracy. Within feminist definitions, organizational leadership is not equated with formal roles and is more concerned with collective activities and values (Blackmore, 1989). Thus, the process of leadership becomes educative, conducive to democratic process, and consistent with the professed goals of education.

Feminist critiques are concerned with revealing how discourses within organizational analysis distort relations (Oseen, 1993).

Feminist critiques advocate the transformation of practices so that both empirical and pedagogical work can be not about positioning oneself but can be about creating a small space where those directly involved can act and speak in their own behalf (Lather, 1991).

Feminists have advocated research that challenges the status quo of leadership theories as guided by the traditional positivist male paradigm. The feminist critique is that the real challenge facing women in administrative positions in educational organizations is to deconstruct structural values in the most fundamental sense.

Women are in the best position to do this. Due to their overall subordinate status in organizations, women do not possess a controlling interest in perceived reality and can develop a different understanding of the world (Ferguson, 1988). Because women are outsiders in organizational life in general, and especially in organizational leadership, this "outsider" perspective enables a unique vision (Forisha, 1981). Within organizations, "there exists the possibility that outsiders may move beyond fault-finding to create a new social form, which in the end improves the lot of both insiders and outsiders and blurs the distinction between them" (Forisha, 1981, p. 16). Deconstructing from the position of an outsider offers a method for examining the hierarchical oppositions which underpin gender oppression.

Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, and Tarule (1988) proposed the feminine as a different way of knowing and of developing self, voice, and mind. They offered a vision of power that is an alternative to the traditional vision of the control of human and natural resources through position power, expertise, or personal charisma. Belenky et al. (1988) suggested that a masculine metaphor of power is the traditional pyramid in which power resides at the top and is filtered

down to others; however, a feminine metaphor of power is a web, in which all persons who reside on the web are interconnected. Because of this, everyone has some degree of power because everyone's actions resonate with others.

Feminist critiques of leadership are frequently undergirded by discourses about the sharing of power. The traditional definition of power arises from issues within the masculinist discourse about control, dominance, and authority (Blackmore, 1989). Such constructs of power have very often marginalized and silenced women. Feminist discourses reclaim power for productive and democratic purposes. Feminist discourses typically view power as authority-with rather than authority-over others. These discourses are similar to Freire's (1972) concept of "horizontal" rather than "vertical" relationships. As Ferguson stated in 1984:

Feminist discourse offers the potential for reconstituting the basic terms of...life, of altering the discursive field in which knowledge and power are appropriated and expressed. The forms of speaking and acting dominant in bureaucratic discourse offer no legitimized place for

feminist discourse; so the creation of this discourse by calling out the suppressed knowledge of women is itself a political act....Because the relation of theory to practice is not contingent or instrumental but conceptual and constitutive, the act of changing the way we think about the world is a way of changing the world...." (p. 196).

It is evident that Ferguson's view of bureaucracy also questioned the idea of a singular organizational truth grounded in the absolute. Organizational knowledge is not positivist; it is political and, consequently, subjective. Johnson (1981) stated that "the starting point [for any organizational theory] is not a natural given but a cultural construct, usually blind to itself....Every theory starts somewhere; every critique exposes what that starting point conceals and therefore displaces all the ideas that follow from it" (pp. xii-xvi).

The critique is of utmost importance. If females simply move into the culture of the high school principal without benefit of feminist or other critiques of the masculinist discourse, they may find

themselves continually marginalized and dependent on masculine protections. This may thwart the full individual development and effectiveness efforts of women high school principals.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Guba and Lincoln (1981, 1989) noted that the purpose of research and its methodology in the social sciences is the discovery of elements and insights. Stake (1982, 1991) added that research is also about understanding. Research that focuses on discovery and understanding recognizes the existence of multiple realities. Guba and Lincoln (1985) stated that such realities are like the layers of an onion; they are interrelated and each layer provides a different perspective. The inquirer's task is to search out patterns, not for prediction and control, but for understanding (Guba and Lincoln, 1985). Thus, the primary task of research in the social sciences in general, and my project in particular, is to conceptualize and to understand social phenomena.

Feminist Methodology

Ardener (1972) stated that men and women conceptualize their societies and communities differently but that researchers tend to

use masculine research models. Masculine paradigms are more accessible to the researcher because they are the officially accepted models in the research society. Moreover, as I observed in Chapter 2, masculine research models accord with the metaphysical and theoretical outlook of functional positivism which, in the past, has guided many researchers. Because masculine research models accord so well with functional positivist theory, they tend to be presented as the only acceptable models. A feminist challenge to masculine discourse has been phrased by Gross (1986):

To speak as, not for women, is in itself to begin to undo the reign of the proper...singular phallic organization. To speak...to overburden oppositional dichotomous categories by refusing their boundaries...to create a space in which the exploration of many discourses and many women's voices can articulate themselves and force others to listen...[is the purpose of feminist methodology.] (p. 138-139).

The leading researchers are defined by dominant, masculinist discourse, which is structured around hierarchy, the placing of one group over another group. Researchers compete for places at the top of professional hierarchies. Out of such discourse, researchers emphasize prediction and descriptions of the world in terms of hierarchy, dominance, and competition.

The relationship between feminism and methodology has been a long-standing focus of feminists' attempts to change the social status quo. DeVault (1990) wrote that "the dilemma for the feminist scholar, always, is to find ways of working within some disciplinary tradition while aiming at an intellectual revolution that will transform the tradition" (p. 96).

Feminist methodologies offer ways to expand the range of criticism of our social systems (Lather, 1991). Expanding the range of criticism offers the possibility for social researchers to advocate for change. Failure to examine cognitive authority leaves research activities mystified and opens these activities to irrationality. Feminist methodologies question the unexamined exercise of cognitive authority within our present research society (Mies, 1991).

One primary concern of feminist methodologies is how to conceptualize social phenomena. My feminist methodology does not impose conceptual frameworks because imposing such frameworks distorts women's experiences and silences women's own voices (Smith, 1978). Traditional analysis, especially quantitative methods, many times involves the translation of individuals' experience into categories predefined by researchers. I am concerned with conceptual practices with which to explicate social relations as disclosed through investigation and analysis.

In feminist research analyses, knowledge gained solely through rationality is discounted (Simon and Dippo, 1986). Traditional research assumes that there is an absolute grounding for knowledge whether it be objective or subjective, qualitative or quantitative. This is not the case with feminist research. Knowledge is not discovered by a detached and unbiased observer, and knowledge and reality are not hidden to be discovered by knowing 'the way.' In feminist research neither rationality nor science nor epistemology are accorded a position of privilege. Nothing is assumed to be outside relations of power, including the researcher (Benhabib and Cornell, 1987; Oseen, 1993).

Feminist methodologies displace expectations of linearity, clear authoritative voice, and closure and assume that it is impossible to separate the structure and thematic content of thought from the historical and material conditions shaping the lives of its producers (Berger and Luckman, 1966, Mannheim, 1936). Feminist research would be labeled "research as praxis" by Gramsci, an Italian political theorist (1971). "Research as praxis" is a phrase designed to frame Gramsci's call to intellectuals in progressive groups to become increasingly conscious of their situations in the world. This increased consciousness would bring awareness of oppression. Feminist research methodologies reject rationality-based schemes as oppression bound by masculinist discourse. Women may discover their oppression through a discourse that can expand women's grasp of their experiences and their understanding of the power of speech, by disclosing the relations organizing their oppression (Flax, 1990).

Feminist methodologies do not transform subjects into the objects of study or make use of conceptual screens for eliminating the active presence of subjects (Wilkinson, 1986). Instead, feminist methods of thinking and analytic procedures must work to preserve the presence of the active and experiencing subject. Black (1989)

wrote that feminist research "insists on the value of subjectivity and personal experience" (p. 75). Feminist methodology emphasizes the problems in the relationship between researcher and 'subject' and proposes and practices methods of interviewing that do not objectify the research 'other.'

Feminist research does not seek to silence or distort the voices that have spoken to the researcher even though one cannot interpret voices without the insertion of self. Everyone begins from a position in the world, and using language requires attaching one's own meaning (Gergen, 1990). This premise locates an oppression invading our research relationships and the power relations between persons.

Feminist methodologies also explore the social, political, and economic processes that organize and determine the actual basis of experience. Women should speak for themselves and from their experience. Women tell of experience in their research because they have an individualistic concept of it (Stanley & Wise, 1983; Gore, 1990). Individual experience can be considered problematic in research, but Weedon (1987) stated that "the ways in which people make sense of their lives is a necessary starting point for understanding how power relations structure society" (p. 8). All

feminism is about power, not so much about winning it or seizing it, but about deploying it in ways that extend the range of freedoms available to all.

Methodology and Purpose

The purpose of this research was to share the experiences of these individual women and to describe them in a way that facilitates the reader's interpretation of their stories. This may lead others to re-evaluate their own processes and situations. Stake (1991) stated that in any research it is the reader's responsibility to provide the reference population, that is, the comparison groups. It was not my purpose in this dissertation to draw firm conclusions about relationships between females and the culture of the secondary principalship. However, through this research may come naturalistic generalizations and new understandings about aspects of feminine leadership discourse in high schools.

Wolcott (1973) noted that most dissertations on educational administration involve surveys, "usually by mailed questionnaire, of ten, a hundred, or a thousand administrators, subsequently tallied up and treated with some...statistical interpretation which substitutes one type of significance for another" (p. xii). Feminist researchers

have favored a different perspective and the opportunity for significance based on personal meaning. My research involved personal, face-to-face interviewing as my method of gaining meaning.

Guba and Lincoln (1981, 1985) saw the semi-structured interview as the backbone of significant research. In the semi-structured interview, the format is not standardized, and responses are not expected to be normative. The interviewee participates in providing both questions and answers. The focus is on reactions to broad issues raised by the interviewer who, in turn, relies on the interviewee to tell the researcher what is not known. The use of semi-structured interviews has become the principal means by which feminists within the social sciences have sought to achieve the active involvement of research participants in the construction of data about their lives (Graham, 1986). The semi-structured interview refers to a research approach whereby the researcher plans to ask questions about a given topic but allows the data-gathering conversation itself to determine how the information is obtained (Oakley, 1981). Yet, the development of a feminist method has to go beyond interviewing practices and research relationships to explore

methods of thinking that will organize inquiry so as to preserve the presence of actual subjects while exploring and explicating the relations in which everyday worlds are embedded. By problemizing the everyday through actual subject voices, feminist discourse may open an experimental window in organizational analysis.

It was my plan to use semi-structured interviews as my methodology. I loosely structured these interviews around a few questions and then allowed each conversation to develop:

- 1. Tell me some stories about the intersection of gender and your job as secondary principal.**
- 2. Why did you choose the career path you have followed?**
- 3. Tell me about getting your first administrative job.**
- 4. Describe how you deal with students, especially in disciplinary situations.**
- 5. Talk to me about what you look like at work. What do you wear to school?**
- 6. Give me a picture of the leadership structure within your school. Your district.**
- 7. Describe your relationship with your secretary. Your superintendent.**

8. What is your day like? Tell me about the things that you do.
9. If you could direct school renewal, what would it look like?
10. What is the purpose of high school today?
11. Is there anything else you would like to tell me that would give me an understanding of you within this job as high school principal?

I asked these questions of four women principals previous to beginning my actual study in order to pilot test the effectiveness of my questions. The present research was conducted with five female high school principals from northern Ohio. Because some feminist methodology interviews relatively few people but in great depth, there is precedent for talking with just a few individuals. In her study of organizational newcomers, Oseen (1993) interviewed only four people. Hudson (1993) used only six principals when she studied feminine understandings of power.

The Human Subjects Committee at Youngstown State University determined that this study was exempt, but informed consent forms were still obtained from each participant. All of the interviews in this research were tape recorded and transcribed. I read the transcriptions and developed a sense of how these principals viewed the issue of gender within the culture of the secondary principalship.

The interview transcripts are available at the end of this dissertation for continued interpretation by others. I recognize that my positioning as a white female secondary school principal who wrote from a feminist perspective significantly defined my analysis and that my meanings were subjective. I was aware that the conversations were really "a political dance of meaning." (Oseen, 1993, p. 194). These conversations served as my method to explore and explicate the way in which these five women viewed the culture of the high school principal.

CHAPTER 4

THE FINDINGS: LUCY, FAY, TESS, BETTY, AND SALLY

In doing the work for this chapter I extracted words from each woman's discourse and provided my own analysis of these words in a way designed to facilitate interpretation by others. My interpretations were grounded in the literature I have read as well as my own position as a high school principal. I used some questions to guide my analysis. What are the modes of resistance and acceptance used by five women in negotiating their role within the culture of the high school principal? If they struggle to find their place, how do they demonstrate that? Does their discourse recognize that the cultural expectations of gender may be incongruent with the organizational expectations of being a high school principal? If there are contradictions between what the dominant discourse has told them and what they actually come to know by doing their work, how do they reconcile those differences? These are the questions that guided this chapter.

Lucy

Lucy is the principal of an urban school with a student population of about 1100. Lucy is 57 and was the third, and youngest, child in her family. She was the only daughter in a single-parent family. Lucy identifies herself as an African-American. A transcript of Lucy's interview can be found in Appendix A.

Lucy entered teaching after trying various other career options. She began college to become an accountant and then a nurse, but she disliked both of these areas of training. She then started her education at a small southern college to become an elementary school teacher. After teaching for a period of time, Lucy earned her Masters' degree in counseling and was a counselor for several years at the middle school level. She was an assistant principal at the middle school and then at the high school level, after which, in 1989 she became the principal of this large urban school.

Lucy recognized that some men within the institution felt challenged by her application to be principal, but she did not mention the concept of organizational patriarchy. She actually seemed to reject cognitively the idea of gender as an element of organizational discrimination. However, she stated that when she applied for the

job of principal, an assistant principal told her that she was "taking food out of the mouth of a man's family." Lucy said, "...to them it was as if I had infringed upon something...I had stepped over a line that this is as far as you are supposed to go and if you do that...what kind of powers are you going to take away from them. It was almost, I could see it happening, I don't know how to explain it to you, but I could see from a counseling point-of-view. I could see the struggle that went on in the minds of men to outdo me. I could see the guys working around here to make sure that they got recognition for everything that they did...."

Lucy did not appear to view patriarchy as an essential component of women's exploitation but as an accidental aberration. She did acknowledge the self-interest of particular men in particular places. "Well, I think that this is the very nature of the conservative side of [Anytown] itself. It just wasn't ready. You had to prove yourself. I think I had to do that. And I think being an assistant principal allowed me the opportunity to prove that I could handle the position as a principal... Like I said, I think it's a lot of Boards of Education and a whole lot of people and superintendents who never, you know, because those are men. For women to come in and say, 'I

can do that job,' you would have to prove yourself. It's unfortunate we have to work so hard to prove ourselves. You do have to work much harder to do that. It's unfortunate but we do."

These comments seem to indicate that Lucy recognized herself as a token in the culture of secondary educational administration. Lucy articulated that she was not viewed as an individual first but as a member of a marginalized group. "And I think it kind of helped, and I don't mean it, I think it helped other school districts in and around [Anytown], too, to realize that if a female can handle the job in [Anytown], then other school districts begin to look at it and say, 'By George, we should be able to do that same thing.' Because up until then, there was no females in these positions at all around this area...."

Lucy's discourse indicated that her leadership centered around care and nurturance, a feminist concept advanced by Noddings (1992), and a contrast to the personal detachment of bureaucracy. "But it was some place along the line between 1972 and 1975 that I just watched what was happening with administrators, mostly men. I just watched what they were doing with kids and how kids were getting into trouble constantly and the kind of attitude they had towards

kids. And I just thought, 'I can do this as well as they can or better because I think I have more interest, more of the kids' interest in heart rather than just pulling out a book and simply saying this is what you did and this is the suspension you get for that.' No regards for how the kid felt. No real trying to work with the parent. Trying to work with the kid. None of that. It was just a matter of like a slap. You did it. This is what you got. Goodbye. You know, and angry parents, angry kids going in and out of the office constantly. And that was what made me decide I wanted to go into administration. I really kind of felt it did not have to be such a--I don't know--such an ugly way to deal with people. There was no caring about them. You know, being an administrator, and I'm sure that everybody can't do that, but being an administrator sometimes you can be caring at the same time. You can tell a kid almost anything as long as they think you care about them. And if you show them that you care about them. I can suspend a kid tomorrow and, as long as he or she thinks I care about them, I can bring them back in the next day and talk with them, and they can go about their business. But I just thought the business was just so cold, and that was my reason for getting into it."

Lucy's discourse on care is parallel to the tenets proposed by Noddings (1992) who proposed that educational administration needs to develop into a caring profession. Lucy's discourse indicated that she was not willing to place institutional mandates ahead of her care for students.

Lucy's discourse seemed to recognize the masculinized discourse of the organization as an extension of the patriarchal family, although this did not cause her to criticize directly either the institutional arrangement of the family or of the organization. Lucy still saw the problem as belonging to individuals. "I do think that a lot of whom I worked with really felt for a long time that it was a power struggle. I think men do got gall in general. It's just like a marriage. Who's got to be the boss? I mean they got to be the boss, if they're not the bosses then, if they can't show where I'm the guy who thinks quicker than you, or get through better than you, or something like that. I don't understand that kind of thinking. I just don't understand it."

Like the feminist conceptualization of power developed by Belenky et al. (1986), Lucy's discourse viewed power as something to be shared, not wielded. "So, but we try to do it in a team approach.

Even though everybody in this building knows that the final say or the final--if you've got to appeal or whatever you want to do--it stops here. But we do try to do things, at least I try to do things from a team approach because I think it's only right. That's the way I wanted to be treated when I was an assistant principal. I wanted to have some say in what went on in this building, and I try to treat my assistant principals the same way, so that they have some say about what is going on, and I'm just not telling them this is the way it's going to be today or tomorrow or whatever. So I try to do it from a team approach....Teachers, on the other hand, aren't always that comfortable with that cause they have not yet learned. And we've been going through a process for about the last three years, particularly with staff, trying to get them to do just that, to get them to understand they are important. They play a big role in what happens...they are going to have a major part to do in this whole thing. And I think that some of the feedback we've gotten is that they are beginning to think, 'We are important. That we are really going to have something to do with this'....I think they finally are coming around that they do have some say in some things that are happening...."

Whereas these comments apparently reflect the feminist paradigm concerning power, Lucy's discourse also seemed to contain contradictions to this paradigm. Lucy seemed to recognize herself as institutionally powerful, as some of her comments seem to indicate. "[W]e usually sit down and discuss what is going to happen and if it isn't going the way I think it can go, if I can see where some of the things they are saying is not workable, I'll say that. I'll just say up front where I don't think this is going to work and I'll give them a reason why I don't think it's going to work." The feminist discourse of power-sharing embraces the ideal of participatory decision-making and rejects the idea of limitations imposed by anyone in hierarchical power.

While Lucy's desire to share power extended to the assistant principals and, to a lesser extent, to the teachers, it did not seem to reach the secretaries or custodians. She viewed herself as needing only to "take good care of" the people holding these positions because they do important work and because they are aware of the organization at a different level. "They're like the ears to the world of the school. Really they are."

When Lucy's discourse concerning classified personnel seemed to center only on their worth to the organization, it left them cast in a marginalized role. "[I]t is a group of people that if you want something and if you want your school to run, you better be good to your custodial staff. Because they don't see themselves as being important to the school, and they see themselves in a menial task." Lucy did seem to recognize that the marginalized role of the custodial staff may impact on their performance for the organization, but she does not seem to be able to break out of viewing these people as a means of accomplishing organizational goals.

Lucy's discourse seemed to recognize that schools are structured around academic subjects of liberal education, such as language, mathematics, and science, that privilege masculinist discourse. Schools grounded in masculinist discourse put much emphasis on a narrow form of rationality and little emphasis on other aspects of human life. This view is advanced by both Martin (1985) and Noddings (1992). Lucy indicated that schools do not address the needs of women and may actually devalue them. Lucy's discourse recognized that the marginalization of women in schools was not limited to women principals. Lucy advanced the importance of

Martin's (1985) "gender-sensitive" education. "Well, I mean, this place is for those kids [girls wanting to become mothers], I think, too. In school we offer courses for those kids who want to be moms and who want to be a good one. Teach them how to be a good mother. Teach them how to do that and you won't have, and I think we owe it to them, to teach them how to be good parents. There's a course, there's courses kids can take to teach them to be good parents, and I think that because everyone doesn't want to go be doctors and lawyers. But those people are just as important. So I think we should be able to offer them something in a regular school, in a regular everyday school for those kids. Right now we offer very little. I offer very little here at [Anyschool]. We offer some home ec courses. We offer a GRADS course [program for teenage mothers] here and there, but we really don't offer a lot for these kids. And that's why we turn out some kids some time that aren't so good at mothering. And there are kids who want to be that. But they're afraid to even say it. They really are. They're even afraid to say, 'I don't want to do anything.' So we have kids out here saying I want to go to college, and you know darned well they don't want to go to college. They just

don't want to say, 'I want to be a mom' because we have nothing to offer them."

If given the opportunity, Lucy indicated that she would construct a different kind of school that allows for flexibility around individual differences. "I would make it more child-oriented....And I really believe that schools should fit the needs of the kids in the community in which they serve. And I don't think we do that. I think we structure schools to fit the needs of a particular groups of kids, and we make everyone else fit into that. And I'm not sure we can fit the needs of every kid, but if I had an ideal setting I'd try and do that. Which means that some kids would come to school three hours a day if they needed to. Some other kids would come to school all day long if they needed to. It depends on what kids could come to school all day. There are kids who could stay in school seven or eight hours a day, no problem. There are other kids who can't come to school, should not come to school, but more than three to four hours a day. And they should be out doing something else. And whatever that is I think we should structure a school to do that...."

Lucy indicated that many men want to hold to the status quo. She did not identify such conservatism as part of organizational

oppression preserving the stability of male supremacy. She simply seemed to view conservatism as a characteristic of the men that she knows. "I think that women are a little bit more progressive than men. I think we take a little bit more chances than we think. I think that men will get into a status quo kind of position. They find one that works well and we stay there. We work with it, and we don't take a chance. I don't think men take a chance at wanting to change anything...[c]ause I think they just like things to be as they are. They just aren't going to take a chance at upsetting something and see if it will run differently--a different way. They just like them, you know, men just like to see things run well. It can run the same way for thirty, forty years. It is all right with them. It is the same thing with wearing the same shirt and tie for ten, twenty years. They do that. Wear the same shirt and tie. They don't change. You know, you wouldn't dare do that. Neither would I. You wouldn't think about wearing the same and you know, it is a dumb analogy, but it is. You wouldn't think about wearing the same dress that you wore ten, even five years ago. Guys will wear the same suits they've worn for the last ten years. You know, and that's just the way I think it's different."

Lucy recognized that the school organization had not changed either, even though she felt that it needed to do so. "We still teach school the ways that were taught twenty, thirty years ago. That isn't the way kids learn anymore. We all know that our kids do not learn the same, but we still expect them to....We just have not decided yet, as communities and as Boards of Education, we have not decided that the future lies in giving our kids a good head start. We still believe because we went to school twenty-five, thirty years ago that English, math, science, social studies, taught the way it was, was fine. It was. It was fine for me, but I don't think it's fine for the generation of kids we have coming today....The kids that are coming in to you with a whole different frame of reference and you coming from that same unwillingness to change." Lucy's discourse did not draw the conclusion that because men did not like change and were the majority in institutional leadership roles, that the strength of patriarchy was responsible for the lack of change.

Lucy indicated that her attire emphasized comfort. Her comments seemed to indicate that she did not devote a lot of time to satisfying social expectations and dressing "suitably." "I'm comfortable. I wear things that are comfortable--what I consider

are comfortable. I won't wear anything that I consider uncomfortable just for...you know, I won't wear it for somebody else. I won't wear it because you tell me I think you ought to wear that. I'm not comfortable, and I won't wear it. I won't do that any other time either, not just work. I wear the same thing I wear to work, you know, if I'm going out some place. You know I have certain things I won't wear out other places. But as a rule I have clothes I wear to school and I wear them some place else, you know. If I am going out for an evening out I may dress up a little bit more but I wear the same things....But I wear a lot of jackets, a lot of blouses and jackets and slacks or skirts. I don't wear heels too much anymore. I used to but the age has gotten to the point where you don't wear too many of those anymore. You want to move pretty fast, you know. And truly the job does dictate that, though. It really does. I mean if you want to and you got high school kids and you want to keep up with them, you really. It does. It kind of dictates you just don't. You want to keep up. And you are on your feet a lot. You don't wear those kind of things anymore."

Lucy's discourse did not seem to articulate oppression as an autonomous power hidden as a rational feature in masculinist

organizational discourse. Her discourse seemed to emphasize her individuality, and she seemed to recognize her oppression as perpetuated by individual men. She did not directly question the conceptual framework of the organization, yet she seemed to identify herself as an outsider because of her gender. She deconstructed many organizational practices of power and privilege, and this deconstruction may have enabled her to develop her alternate discourse in leadership practice.

Fay

Fay is the principal of a rural school with a student population of 342. She is 47 and is the oldest sibling, having a younger brother and a younger sister. Fay identifies herself as Caucasian. A transcript of Fay's interview is located in Appendix B.

Fay entered teaching in the area of mathematics. She stated that she "always" knew she wanted to teach math because she felt that the career choices in math were limited for women "back then." Fay entered administration as a high school assistant principal, and she became the principal at this small rural school in 1991.

Fay did not identify the power of patriarchy as a problem in attaining a position in high school administration. Fay's discourse

seemed to center on herself as an individual and her individual capabilities. "I don't think gender was considered when I was hired for this job. I think that the fact the previous board said, 'This is a woman we know, taught in the building, did well, worked well with kids, worked well with the community, was involved in all these activities, has credibility in our mind.' I don't think they thought of me as male or female. I don't think they sat and said, 'Should we put a woman in charge?' They were putting [Fay] in charge, and that to them was not a gender issue."

Although Fay excused the previous board members from considering the issue of gender, Fay recognized that her gender is an issue to some people. "And there are areas that I go that--'There's the broad. The token is sitting at the table.' 'Yeah, proud to be here. Thank you very much.' I don't think I'm looked at as gender by most people. There are those who will always look at it as gender, and that's their problem....There are those who will absolutely not even talk to me. This year, I happen to be president of the [athletic] league, which is a rotating thing, certainly not anything elected, because you don't even want to run for this office. There are guys who will not deal well with that. They won't deal well with that--just

blow off your ideas and decisions. And that's O.K. because I sit right beside them at the next meeting and, 'Here I am, John, and yes, you're going to have to listen to me, and yes, my ideas have credibility and if you don't like it, that's your problem. You're going to have to deal with it.'" Fay's discourse did not seem to indicate that she felt oppressed because of her gender. Some people may apparently dismiss her and her ideas because of her gender, but she seemed to believe that was an occasional aberration perpetrated by specific individuals. She indicated that her continued presence would give her credibility. Thus, her devaluation because of her gender was apparently viewed as an individual problem that she, as an individual, could solve. She did not articulate it as an essential part of a patriarchal system.

Fay's attire was related to her role within the organization as traditionally defined. Fay's discourse combined her appearance with her professional accomplishments. "I try to dress very well. I believe that the appearance lends some credibility to the individual. If there is a parent coming in here, and you will notice behind me are all of my diplomas and all of my certificates, and all of my plaques, and everything else. When the person sits here and looks at [Fay], I

want them to see behind me--hey, I've done my dues here. I know a little about what I speak. I don't want to be sitting here in sweatshirts and jeans. I want them to say, 'This is a professional that commands respect physically as well as educationally.' I'm a firm believer in that kind of issue. Some people are not. Some people are very modest in their 'We don't want to tell anyone what kind of workshops and courses we've been to.' I think it lends credibility to me. So, I tend to dress in suits, in good dresses, in--and they harass me--always have high heels on. I do not wear, unless I'm wearing slacks, and once in a while I wear a slack suit, and I wear flats or something of the sort, and that's fine. And days that I'm going to be running like a banshee throughout the building because I know things are going on, I'll wear flats, but, I believe I must dress the part of the professional leader of this building, so I tend to do that."

Besides the masculinized attire, there were other aspects of Fay's discourse that did not appear to question the masculinist discourse of the high school principalship. She emphasized the similarities between men and women and did not think that changing the gender of the majority of high school principals would change much of what happened. "What would be different? I don't know

that I think, right off the top of my head, that anything would be different. Women have the same ideas. Women have the same, you know, we certainly have the same intellect. We have the same motivation for kids. I don't know that anything would be different. No, I don't believe that we're all of a sudden going to have flowers and cookies at all of the League meetings because the girls' [are] in charge. I don't believe in those sexist kind of issues. But, I think that things would be the same. Maybe it would lend more credibility to those that are there."

Perhaps it is a risk for Fay to state, "Women are different and this is what it might be like." Fay may be reluctant to become identified with women's viewpoints because this may mean identification with stereotyped expectations or, in an oppositional society, may mean identification as 'lesser' by being 'the other.' Fay's discourse regarding women's emancipation apparently works by claiming similarity with men subjects.

Like Lucy, Fay's discourse also matched Noddings' (1992) care and nurturance paradigm as a part of her leadership. "I want the kids to see me. I want to be approachable. I want them to know that I'm just--I'm just here. I'm always around...I try to walk around, talk to

kids. Go, 'Hey, good wrestling match last night.' 'I was very proud of your behavior at the basketball game'....Those kinds of things. Just interacting with the kids....I am a hug person. I need to touch. I'm one of those people, for whatever our sensory kinds of things are, you will frequently see me hug a kid. I always shake hands with a kid before they leave my office. It's a thing of saying, 'You did this. This is the consequence. I'll sign your pass. We shake hands. Thank you very much'. And we move on. I need them to understand that consequence doesn't mean you're a bad person. It means you made a dumb decision. I think that's where a woman--and here we go, it's a gender kind of thing--it's O.K. for me to be compassionate. It's O.K., and this is the bad part for the man kind of thing, men who are compassionate, who are caring, who--[Pauses] I can hug kids far easier than a man without fear of reprisal. Pure and simple, and I do. I'm always hugging kids. That's just the way I am, and the kids are cool about it. They understand it and they just, 'O.K., fine.' And they understand, just because you're suspended doesn't mean you're a bad person, doesn't mean, I don't like you, doesn't mean we're not going to be getting along fine. Doesn't mean that a week from now, I'm

going to throw it up in your face. It means, we dealt with it today, and this is the consequence, and now we're going to move on."

While Fay stated that she can be nurturing, she indicated that she can also fit the prevailing model of administrative dominance of students. "[T]hey believe that we want elementary principals to be nurturing, to be kind, to be loving, to be all of those things. Well, excuse me, why in the Dickens cannot a secondary principal have those same kinds of qualities and at the same time have the ability to kick butt when necessary?....I'm not afraid to kick butt and take names."

Fay indicated that she used sexual joking in her dealings with others. In this way, Fay's behavior may be seen as reflecting the dominant masculine culture, because sexual joking may be used by men as a means of maintaining authority. "Basketball. Basketball game starting. Winter time. Group of fans always sits up underneath the sign at the top of the thing. [Whistles] I get one of these things. [Gestures]. Game hasn't started yet, or it's halftime. I go trotting over and one of the guys says, 'You know, you could turn the heat on in this just a little bit.' And I said, 'You don't understand. I think this gym feels real good so you're either going to have to find a guy

principal or a younger woman if you want heat in the gym.' And he went, 'Oh, yeah?' I said, 'It feels real fine to me. I'm having a little heat right now so don't even mess with me with the heat in the gym. O.K.?' And he went, 'O.K.' I think me, it's my personality." Sexual joking can be used as a way to distance people from each other. It can also be used for affirming status and authority differentials. Sexual innuendo can be about the exercise of power and authority in organizations. This anecdote is open to many interpretations.

At times Fay's discourse appeared to embrace a feminist positioning, and at other times it appeared to embrace the masculinist paradigm. This is probably not unexpected. Contradictions may exist between the culture of the feminine and the culture of the high school principal. The feminine embraces care and nurturance. The bureaucratic embraces uniformity and dominance. These are contradictory viewpoints that may impact on Fay's discourse.

Tess

Tess is the principal of a rural/suburban high school with a student population of about 600. Tess insisted that age was not an important demographic, but she indicated that she had been involved in education for 22 years. Tess has a Ph.D. in education. She is the

only daughter of two immigrant parents, her father was "Gypsy" and her mother was Hispanic. A transcript of Tess' interview is in Appendix C.

Tess indicated that she had been determined to go into education since high school. "In high school I had an experience where people of my kind don't get college degrees. They just wind up pregnant or as prostitutes. So I was about to prove them wrong. And each step I was about to prove people wrong, and I was going to be resilient and I was going to defy all the little stereotypes that they had of individuals [like me]." Tess' discourse apparently indicated an early understanding of being in a marginalized position.

Tess recognized a community suspicion surrounding her appointment to the principal's position. "[T]hey were very surprised that a female was hired. The word around the community...that one of them [female] was hired. Not only was she one of them [female], but she was also one of them [person of color], which was a double whammy for them [conservative community members]. A lot of the old power structure that was here--they have not accepted me. They will never accept a woman in a position of--I'll use the term 'power.' I don't see it as a power position. I see it as a leadership

position, and I've had a very difficult time with that....But they would talk about me having candy dishes around and 'Oh, it's that woman' or having flowers around or just really ridiculous having nothing to do with leadership abilities....I'm going to be reassigned at the end of this year because the superintendent sees the community not wanting a woman in this position. Wanting a man. So they're going to reassign someone from the central office, and then I'm going to be reassigned to his position and I said, "I'm not going to be reassigned. My vocation is to be a building administrator. It is not to play these ridiculous games that every day there's another rumor or a lie. My office is so bland now....I used to have a theme. There was a theme and we'd carry it over to the office. For Halloween I had skeletons on a table cloth and 'Oh, my God, she's a witch and she's practicing witchcraft.' And this goes on and on, every month something ridiculous, and it just got to the point where I went, 'Well, I'll just make it as bland as possible.' It's really hard for me because you know you have to assert your personality. When you can't, then this is not the right place....No one should be put through this crap. And just because of your gender--that's absurd, that's absurd."

Tess' attire was in some ways a deviance from the sanctioned male-defined managerial norms. Tess stated that she at first used conditions of dress as a way to demonstrate her difference from the traditional masculinist norms; however, she eventually sacrificed her own preferences for a look more characteristically invested with a power dimension. "I used to wear sneakers everyday--different colored sneakers to match my outfits and the men could not accept it so what I did during Lent is I wore real shoes and I told them it was a result of Lent and I told them that I was going to go back to sneakers...really bold pink sneakers or flowered sneakers....And it was also a lot easier to get around, because even the other people, if there was a fight, they'd all go, 'Well, are you going to go?' And so, I'm not going to wear heels and be clompin' around on three stories and up the stairs, and down the stairs, and things like that. I want to be comfortable. What's on your feet, you know. You wear that smile on your face or you grimace walking through the terrazzo floors...."

Yet despite Tess' actions against the perceived norm concerning footwear, she indicated that she wore the established female business suit. "I always wear a suit. Yeah, no more pants....I never wanted to be an administrator who was a male dressed up as a

female. And I think as women we fight with that all the time."

Apparently Tess accepted the patriarchal assumption that women should wear skirts, but she continued to defy other cultural limitations regarding attire.

Tess' discourse indicated that she recognized her leadership as different and that the difference was defined at least in part by gender. "You can still keep your personality and still be a person, your own person, and do a heck of a job as an administrator. I think we damage ourself when we try and be a man, cause that's not what women are. Women are much more nurturing. They have the ability to be flexible and juggle twenty-five balls at the same time. And I think that men should be envious of us."

Tess identified her dealings with students as centered around the feminine pattern of care and nurturance. "I was disappointed [after becoming a principal], because as an assistant principal you deal much more with kids... and that's real frustrating because I really try and get involved with the students as much as I can. As far as finding out how their weekends went, if they had a sporting event, getting involved. Talking to them about their hair or just engaging. When the bell rings, I try to be visible and out in the hall and engaging

with them. I'm not a screamer. One of our interns last year was a screamer, and I felt this was because of the power thing, this was how you make people sort of cringe. And as a matter of fact they gave me a paddle when I first came. I keep it in the corner. But, on a humane level, exactly how I want to be treated with respect, I treat students that way."

Tess recognized that her dealings with students on the personal level violated the institutional norms which she identified this way: "Get 'em in, get 'em out. That's the mentality. Get 'em in, get 'em out." She seemed to want this school to develop into a less formal, more inviting, place. "I interviewed in the summertime so I never had an opportunity to see the school in action, and I figured when nothing was on the walls it was probably because it was summer cleaning. Well, that's the way the school is. They have pride in the fact that this is a very surgical environment."

Tess' discourse concerning power apparently matched Belenky et al.'s (1986) feminist paradigm in many ways. She implemented various kinds of shared decision-making groups, including an administrative team group, a teacher group, and a counseling group; however, her discourse contained contradictions. Tess appeared

resentful of teachers who blocked her agenda for reform. "I implemented a shared decision making team. Well, they all wanted to be on the shared decision team to block my decisions. And that was real obvious from the onset, that we're going to vote against her just because we're voting against her....And as a lead building administrator you're supposed to deal...with the obstinate characters on the staff....I would say that half of them [teachers on the decision-making team] have a hidden agenda; half of them are the informal leaders of the school. And the other half are the people who wanted to see change, and they wanted to know what was happening--what the inner circle was like, but they're very hesitant because the informal network is very assertive and can make their life miserable."

Contained in Tess' discourse is the apparent understanding that the structure of schools is difficult to change because it is tied to the power of patriarchal society. "Education is often times like the Vatican, just refusing to make any changes. Not going to change. [Educators think] we're going to go back to an industrialized society any day now."

Tess' discourse did not identify gender oppression as a construct of the modern organization as such, but rather as a part of the

discourse of certain individuals in a particular location. She stated, "I wouldn't have lasted in the ranks here very long." and "If a relationship is not working [her relationship with teachers and Board of Education], then get out of the relationship." "I think that he's [the superintendent] been very frustrated because that I'm the first woman in the district. There have been no forerunners to me. And that he deals with a lot of flack from the Board of Education. And really the Board of Education wanted me to be reassigned....I guess I'm very open and candid, not aggressive, but I'm assertive. And they [the teachers] have a difficult time. They will spread rumors and innuendos...rather than confront you. No one confronts you. I believe in an open door policy...and the staff here would rather pass notes to one another rather than actually confront you because they're afraid. They've never been asked and they've never had a voice here....Head custodian has a very difficult time with me because I'm a woman. It's gotten to the point, 'Well, why is she asking me these questions all the time? She doesn't know what's goin' on.' And that gets back to me and that's really a concern. And I've tried to give him more responsibility with supervising his staff...[but] he doesn't want me to ask him for his opinion all the time." Tess' discourse recognizes that

she is marginalized by others because of her gender, but she identifies it as a result of particular people or a particular place. "They will spread rumors and innuendos, and that's not typical of small communities, because I've been in small communities before, rather than confront you."

Tess identified her efforts to eliminate some of the bureaucracy within the school. "On referral system, I said, 'Well, you know, you need to call the parents if there's a problem.' 'Well, the building principal always used to call.' 'What a waste', I said. 'If you had open-heart surgery and something went wrong in the operating room, would you want the chief of surgery to talk to the family? Or would you want the person who actually did the operation? Why would you want to engage all these other people? You know what happened. You talk to the parent. We'll handle any fights or anything like that, but, if somebody doesn't bring a pencil to class--give me a break. You call the parent or don't write the referral out.' I had a difficult time with that. A lot of ownership, putting it back--a lot of things like that."

Tess's discourse, like Lucy's and Fay's, followed Noddings' (1992) view that schools needed to change into places that were more

nurturing for students and more respectful of individuals. "Just trying to do things for kids. The school's never been here for kids. And trying to do that--you're changing, you're changing. We just get 'em in and get 'em out. We don't want to interact or anything like that. Oh, God...." Tess' ideal school "would...[have] no bells. People would work as teams; they would work collaboratively and work on interdisciplinary projects. And it would be a lot of pride and a lot of respect for one another. Isn't it a shame that that's reform?" Tess identified the present system as punishing to students. "Our purpose is to prepare people for their next phase in life. That's what secondary school should be. Not one of being punitive."

Tess spoke with an apparent anger. Tess identified her differences from patriarchal norms as unacceptable to this school's faculty and this community's members. She did not indicate an understanding that her differences would continue to cause her problems elsewhere. She identified her choices as either muting her difference or leaving this particular place. She indicated that she would pursue the latter alternative.

Betty

Betty is the principal of a wealthy suburban school with a student population of about 450 in grades 7 to 12. Betty has been in school administration for about 21 years and has a Ph.D. in education. Betty identifies herself as Caucasian. A transcript of Betty's interview can be found in Appendix D.

Betty has a female assistant principal. This image of two women in leadership positions within one high school formed a part of Betty's discourse. "I found out later that the faculty had made bets that we wouldn't last until December because we were both female. Interestingly, but not surprisingly, we had become very quickly good friends. And we're both people who consider ourselves people who don't make close relationships very quickly, but in this case we did, and it's been a delightful relationship. It poses no problems, no challenges, but we have become very close. We became close very quickly. We have similar interests, and we're a generation apart, and that's kind of interesting, too. So, you can imagine, just as quickly, which was not a surprise at all, that the lesbian stuff didn't come far behind it. My perception was, O.K., we did get along, we didn't meet their expectation that we'd be 'clawing her eyes out.' We redefined

leadership and team work for two females. I think that's how you do it. I think it's different. I think communication is very different. I think leadership had to be redefined. And so I think one of the very conscious attacks was, 'They must be lesbians.' Must be because they're running everyday. They shower together. And so, I make sure I kiss her once in a while...but, that's my current favorite that I like to share. 'Yeah, they're doin' a hell of a job and they're really good and they're such good friends, they work so well and they're very effective--my God, they must be lesbians.'"

Lesbians do not embrace patriarchy's gender expectations and thwart the established patriarchal order. Lesbian women are not dependent on men. When women are able to work together without the help of men, as in the relationship between Betty and her assistant, it is a deviance within masculinized discourse, much as lesbianism is. It is hard to find exemplary stories of solidarity and initiation among women, while for men such stories are legend. Betty's relationship with her assistant was viewed as a deviance because of their effectiveness and their friendship. They didn't need a man to make it work.

Betty's discourse articulated understanding of her membership within a marginalized group. Similar actions performed by members of marginalized groups and members of dominant groups can be perceived very differently. "That was one thing that the district complained, was very critical of me in my initial evaluation. And it's been very interesting, the way they've evaluated me here. My first evaluation, they said 'The perception the students have, and some of the parents, is that you're very cold and uncaring.' And I said 'O.K., that's fine. That's the first time anyone's ever told me that and I'll look at that, I'll certainly examine that, but I'll tell you some reasons that's being said.' I said, 'It's a gender issue.' I came into this district, they were looking for a strong leader to straighten out a number of problems. For a year they were looking for this person and I believe they found it in me or a hundred people wouldn't have said that's the person for the job. So then, when I took action, there were some unpleasant decisions to make. And I don't think it was any reflection on how cold, nurturing, warm I was, I believe if it was a male in that position that they would have viewed the person as being a take charge, being assertive. And to this day I truly believe in

my heart that no one would have told someone with a penis that they were cold or uncaring. They would have said, 'Good job.'

There are strong perceptions within the dominant cultural discourse about how a woman should look or act. Pressures for gender-typed behaviors are strong; so individuals generally will conform to gender expectations. This often transforms gender-based essentialism into self-fulfilling prophecy. Gender-related behavior is attached to social expectations and hierarchies that are linked to gender. Many times when women act in ways considered inappropriate to their gender expectations, they are censured and further marginalized. If Betty appears warm and nurturing, she would risk negative evaluation for failing to convert to the masculinist discourse of bureaucracy. If Betty appears cold, she cannot fulfill gender expectations. Betty is marginalized when she acts like a man, because she is not, yet she also risks marginalization if she acts like a woman.

"When I first started administration, I went out and bought five old man suits, and I keep them for a memory. I got them in Ann Arbor at a tailor shop. I thought this was the way to do it. And my husband would say, 'You might as well wear the same one everyday

cause they all look alike.' So, I was really feeling bad--I was younger and that was real important to me. And, I did it for a long time--I dressed like that. These were little skirt suits. You could have put this on a small man and just put a skirt on--and they're beautifully tailored--they're hanging in the closet still. It's a shame I won't wear them. Now I'm in this place that I don't like to do dolly-dress-up very often. And it's interesting, when I do the dolly-dress-up and the heels...the compliments I receive from people is just incredible--just incredible. And when I don't wear my suit and my heels, I think I look just fine. I always wear a blazer. That I wear it with a loose fitting dress and flat shoes and tights, and I can step back and say, 'It's a different kind of fashion, but it's still very professional.' It's not wearing nose rings and it's very acceptable, but I find it fascinating, absolutely fascinating, if I put on a pair of shoes like this that aren't flat and a suit like this, the response I get is just fascinating. I had one faculty member two years ago, he saw me coming in one day and he said, 'Now, that's how I want my principal to look.' 'Thanks for sharing'....I think it was a paradigm shift. I figured out that I didn't have to be a miniature man--that I could embrace being female."

Sally

Sally is the principal at a large urban school with a student population of about 1000. Sally's school is set in the midst of violence and poverty in an area of urban blight. Sally has been in educational administration for twenty years. She began her educational career as a science teacher and then became a guidance counselor. Her first administrative job was in a middle school. Sally identifies herself as African-American. A transcript of Sally's interview can be found in Appendix E.

Sally's discourse appeared to be unburdened by marginalization. Her discourse did not articulate oppression born of patriarchy. Although identifiable as twice marginalized by both race and gender, Sally did not articulate an awareness of oppression. Sally's integration into the existing institutional arrangements appeared more complete than that of any of the others interviewed.

Sally could think of only one way that her gender and job intersected. "[A]s you can tell, I have a very low voice, so a lot of times, I'm mistaken by telephone as a male. And a lot of times people, thinking that the principal is a male, just automatically assume--then my voice--more or less accept that fact. So, I've had

occasions where people come in and see me for the first time and they're expecting this robust male...." No reflection was offered about why people would expect her to be a "robust" male.

Sally's discourse indicated a leadership centered on domination rather than nurturance. "I guess I had earned a reputation of being a disciplinarian....I like to think that I'm very fair. An old cliché. But very assertive. I've always felt that students want to be disciplined...that's the only thing that allows us to continue to be in control....I golf. I used to think that I put a lot of wrist action into my golf stroke, and that carried over to the paddle. That was very comical, because people judged your ability to paddle by your size, and any time I would hit someone with the paddle, it was always surprising to them that someone as small as I am, and at that time I was small, I'm not so small anymore, not only short in stature, but I was always so very small. Surprise, I think that was the main element. Parents and people I run into now, they still talk about the fact of how meaningful that part of my job was."

Sally did not identify patriarchy as a factor hampering her in attaining her position. She recognized herself as embraced by the bureaucratic system. "I was chosen for it [the principal's position] to

an extent. I chose to go into teaching. And at that time, my only plan was to teach. Having been in teaching, and was fairly successful, I like to think, as a teacher, and did enjoy. Got a lot of self-satisfaction out of it. And was advised and encouraged by my superiors, my supervisors, and those I worked with and under, to pursue other...that I should go further....I was in counseling...and it's been a long time ago--19 to 20 years ago...I was head of the guidance department at this middle school, and it seems that I have always been chosen to go into schools where there are problems. And at this time they were having a problem at one of the other middle schools, a young man had just been killed, and at that time it was before the era of the gangs in schools as we know it today, but this particular school was a little out of control. And they needed to send someone there; so they asked me to go there. So they tapped me, so to speak, to go to this one school. That's when I was put in as an administrative intern, and that was my first administrative experience and position. Much like the same way I came here. I mentioned that I came here in the middle of the school year, at the time when the school was in terrible [shape]...they asked me to come here. I guess, if I have a story to tell, that is a story."

Even though Sally's discourse mentioned committee work, that work seemed to center around a bureaucratic mandate rather than a desire to share power. "[O]ther times I spend a lot of time with teachers, committees. We're in this redirect, refocusing, five-year strategic planning, and so we're spending a lot of time with that."

Sally would redesign the high school, but her discourse regarding change was somewhat different than the others who spoke in this research. Others mentioned people-oriented changes for collaboration and nurturance. Sally spoke about change in the school building facility. "The first I would do would be to secure my building. I would secure the building so that those of us who must be here would not have to have that as a concern in terms of our safety and well-being. And I think it could be done very easily if we had the money to do it."

However, Sally articulated that the purpose of high school did need to change. "I think it should be a place where we are taking kids and helping them to become well-rounded individuals, well-rounded adults. I say well-rounded. I think there is a lot of place for the fact that we have to teach them how to be social beings, that's going to be important in their lives as important as knowing the date

of the founding of America. I mean, that's important, too, but my desire would be to have a sense of making them become people-oriented so that they would be better citizens and would know how to get along with each other." Sally's discourse seemed to mostly focus on developing students who would fit into the public realm, by being "better citizens."

Even though Sally did not focus on her marginalization, she still recognized that things are different for her because she is female. "I'm usually here until 4:30. That's when I try to get bulletins written. There's still a lot of work that people feel is female work. Like writing bulletins, the guys [assistant principals] don't want to sit down and do that kind of stuff. But, they're learning." Sally did not question why she, as the principal, still felt required to fulfill a gender-based expectation for the male assistant principals.

Sally's discourse contained no identification with the students. Students seemed to be "the other" to Sally. "It just bothers me that kids now just--there's no appreciation for each other. Life just has no meaning to them. I don't know if it's a sign of this particular area, this environment that they're coming out of, or if that is something that's true nationwide. I kind of feel it's a nationwide thing. I feel

for young people now-a-days, I really do." These statements seemed to express a separation from students.

Sally's attire fit her role within the organization as determined by traditional bureaucratic expectations. "I think we have an obligation to set an image. I'm very conscious of how I look, and I feel I have an obligation to do that. We try to teach kids to be ready for...I just had a thing this morning with a group of students that we're getting ready for summer internship. Talking about an area saying, 'Well, I like this style, I want this style.' I said, 'I like style, too, but I don't style to come to work, I wear appropriate clothes to work. I style when I'm on my own time. You have to style when you're on your own time. When you go out in these corporations, you've got to go looking the way that they expect you to look.' They don't understand that, and I think we have to set the example. I can't say to them, 'There is a proper way to dress or what we perceive as proper,' and then come looking otherwise." Apparently, Sally did not want students in this high school to accentuate their difference from the corporate norm. The emphasis still appeared to be on students developing into successfully assimilated public people. Perhaps Sally is trying to integrate her largely black student

population into the traditional culture of power that she seems to have assimilated. The price to pay for that assimilation may be the silencing of the students' own voices so that they may have a chance to fit high into the authority pyramid. Sally, herself, is positioned to be 'the other' yet Sally's discourse seems locked into the paradox of conformity. Sally's message may be that equality is constituted by a denial of difference. This the message of traditional, 'shirt and tie' bureaucracy, sameness is a form of domination by which to sustain society's givens of privileged masculinist discourse. It is the position of master discourse to see everyone the same in order to accord them dignity and respect. Yet, this is an expression of domination and not a cure for it. Feminist discourses claim the goal of ending domination and not the ending of difference.

In order to fit in, Sally may have behaved the same or acted like a man. Sally's discourse operates in such a way as to maintain the link between women and subordination and men and domination: act like a man and be dominant, act like a woman and be subordinate. To dismantle that would be to dismantle the patriarchal system itself, and that system has rewarded Sally. In the system, gender and

power coalesce; in this process, a high school principal may not necessarily be a man, but a high school principal acts like a man.

Sally is an outsider, yet the domination of the system toward sameness seems to have turned her to insider, masculinist discourse. She has learned the boundaries well, but this may have sabotaged her chances to remake and transcend them. Denying Sally difference can be oppression. Sally appears to have been silenced.

Women's silence can serve to reinforce negative stereotypes and marginalization. Unless women are heard, women can remain the marginalized other. Silence works towards the erasure, rather than the affirmation, of difference. Sally needs to be heard. Perhaps, at some level, she knows it. "What do you do when you get here?" I asked Sally. "What's the first thing you do?"

"Scream."

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this research was to examine the methods of resistance and acceptance used by five individual women in the culture of the high school principalship. I did this by presenting their discourses and describing their methods in a way designed to facilitate the reader's interpretation. I recognized my limitations in doing this work. What Lincoln and Guba called "outcomes" and "lessons to be learned" must, by necessity, be somewhat personal (Hudson, 1993). It is not the purpose of this dissertation to draw positivist conclusions about relationships between women and the culture of the secondary principalship. Conclusions are personally created. As Smith (1990) stated, "We're not after the truth, but we do want to know more about how things work, how our world is put together, how things happen to us as they do" (p. 34). Smith's statement summarizes my intent with this research. The conclusions of this research are personally created. It is my intent that this sharing of my findings will develop or challenge the understandings of others.

Research Question

This research has been concerned with meanings that are embedded in five women's discourses regarding perceptions and behavior in the culture of the high school principal. The basic research question was, "What are the modes of resistance and acceptance used by women in negotiating their role within the culture of secondary educational administration?"

Research Methodology

The semi-structured interview was used in this research. While the interviews developed around certain questions, the format was not standardized. The interviewee participated in providing both questions and answers. Yet, this study went beyond interviewing practices and research relationships to explore methods of thinking that explicate the relations in which everyday worlds are embedded. It is possible that only certain concepts and behaviors were available to these women because their feminine gender, the distinction that they chose to make apparent, was already structured in cultural and organizational relations defined by the power of the dominant masculinist discourse.

Concluding Comments

Bureaucratic discourse powerfully molds men and women within any organization. Gender is reinforced or created and recreated in this discourse. Thus, the intersection of gender and knowledge creates women at the same time that it creates what they know. The way women exist as women may depend on how the gender images of what it means to be a woman are bequeathed by a culture at a given time. What a high school principal does and who a high school principal is are inseparable, and the 'who' is not an abstraction devoid of gender constructs. The meaning of what a high school principal is still has not been separated from the term's link to masculine privilege and responsibility.

Within the prevalent culture of the high school principal, women are invisible. Data are not even available to represent them. There are no images. For this reason, women within this culture remain outsiders. The descriptors for successful administrative attributes are masculine. Historical accounts of great leaders are stories of great men. Women leaders are marginalized as tokens or stereotyped as caricatures of "iron maidens." Women high school principals have difficulty wearing power because the image doesn't fit them. When

these five women talked about power, they still talked about men, not about themselves.

The discourse expressed by these women through their conversations at times appeared internally contradictory. Fay, for example, seemed to have a sense of herself as a woman and recognized that she was different from men and treated differently. Tess seemed acutely aware of being devalued because of her gender, and she found this disturbing. She seemed to suffer from feelings of exposure and isolation and endured hostile and patronizing behavior. Although she had full confidence in her competence, she was constantly challenged professionally, often with personal innuendo.

At times, all of these women acquiesced, perhaps unintentionally, to the dominant, masculinized discourse of the culture that they inhabit. They expressed this acceptance in various ways. For example, Fay dressed in ways deemed appropriate by the dominant discourse. Sally wanted her students to assimilate the corporate norm. Lucy's discourse sometimes expressed marginalization of others according to their position in the organization. However, except for Sally, all discourses expressed areas of resistance, too. Betty wouldn't wear "man suits." Fay

hugged her students. Lucy recognized the patriarchal similarities between educational bureaucracy and marriage. Tess wore flowered sneakers.

Stances related to certain social practices are articulated in the discourses of these women. Weedon (1987) referred to such stances as "subject positions." Some of the women in this study stated that they embraced some variation in attire according to what their activities were for a particular day. This is in contrast to men in bureaucratic positions who have made the jacket and tie into a uniform. Because of the established social relationship between cultural definition of dress and gender division, relationships of dress within organizations are characteristically invested with a power dimension. A woman who places herself in masculinized attire could be signifying that she has accepted the male-defined organizational norms. Sally and Fay seemed to have adopted this uniform of dress. The padded suit shoulders and the tailored, conservative styling reflect masculinized attire, perhaps in an attempt to confer on these women the same kind of status that men have. According to Tess and Betty, deviations from the traditional, conservative norm for attire were negatively evaluated by others. These women walked an

appearance tightrope, balancing looking 'feminine' enough so that conventional rules and expectations of gender behavior were maintained, but 'businesslike' enough, or stereotypically masculine enough, so that the issue of gender difference was minimized. These women seemed to recognize that they were dressing for an audience within the culture of the organization. Tess, Betty, and, to a lesser extent, Lucy seemed to resist this culture's mandates on appearance. Fay and Sally seemed to accept it.

For the most part, the women in this study did not share the masculinist view of power as constructed in the bureaucratic pyramid. The feminine metaphor as envisioned by Belenky et al. (1986) views power as a web, as opposed to the power pyramid. All persons who reside in the web are interconnected and have some degree of power because one's actions reverberate on others. The power pyramid has marginalized and silenced women because of their position in it. The web existed strongly in the discourse of Tess. The feminine web, while it seemed to be part of the discourses of Lucy and Sally, was also sometimes contradicted. Their genderized discourse favored web-building. However, the discourse of their profession demanded adherence to the power pyramid.

These women found it difficult to adhere to the status and hierarchy, difficult to act like a man, but they frequently could not make their web strategy of power-sharing work. Others viewed their sharing of power with suspicion. This was articulated most dramatically by Tess. She was enmeshed by strategies of discourse that both required her to act like a man, but didn't allow her to act like a man because she was a woman, and as a woman, she was expected to defer authority to men.

Women have been added on to the organizational strata of the schools, but the school bureaucracy has not really changed. The rules by which people fit in or do not do so are still linked to gender. The discourse in the culture of the high school principal demands that these women act masculine because the feminine gender is subordination. To be powerful is to be masculine. Resistance is there, but what exists is still domination by one gender.

The discourses of Sally and, to a lesser extent of Fay, minimized the differences between men and women as high school principals. Both women's discourses seemed to view the high school principalship much as it is viewed in the dominant discourse. In most organizations gender-based divisions of labor are reinforced by divisions of

authority and power expressed through hierarchy. Hierarchical division by gender is rarely random, and the valuation of men over women is paralleled in the dominant discourse's valuation of the gender of male over the gender of female. When these women spoke in the dominant bureaucratic discourse, they were, in essence, voicing their own cultural devaluation.

In Fay's and Sally's discourses the absence of a recognition of their divergence seemed to be grounded in the oppositional structure of our society. Given birth status in a patriarchal society, men are afforded masculinist discourse privilege. Women are not afforded that privilege. People choose to be masculinized and privileged or to be feminized and not privileged. In oppositional structure, thinking in terms of gender difference denies the principle of equality. As a result, Fay and Sally denied their difference in order to be equal to men. The flaw in this thinking is that equality cannot be achieved by requiring the dissolution of one gender into the other.

The discourses of Fay and Betty mostly seemed to focus on redressing inequality in employment and on reforming attitudes that sustain denial of equality. In seeking equality with men, Fay and Betty seemed to look to reformation of the present system rather

than to radical change of it. They remained accepting of patriarchy at least to some extent. Fay and Betty seemed to define equality as consisting of entry into the masculine world, with no expectations of major changes in that world. Their discourses seemed to focus largely on changing the sex of the people at the top of the educational bureaucracy. With that discourse, women might continue to support educational organizations that promote a man's world "where men, and the women who have entered the fray, joust and jostle for positions of dominance like stags contesting the leadership of their herd" (Morgan, 1986, p. 211). Although these women may view themselves as promoting the cause of women, they may see that as happening within the present institutional frameworks--by perhaps advancing the cause of equality of female athletics, counseling the females in the school, and serving as female role models.

The discourses of Lucy, Tess, and Fay seemed to indicate that they were aware of their marginalized within the culture of the high school principal, but none identified patriarchy, as such, as an essential component of that marginalization. When the discourses of

Lucy, Tess, and Fay identified the source of their marginalization, they gave the names of individual men. The men were there, concrete.

Women principals are not taught to label the abstract masculinist power in their culture as 'patriarchy.' Patriarchy is taken-for-granted in university preparation programs for the principalship, just as it is in the larger culture. Feminist critiques are an anomaly. Patriarchy remains unnamed most of the time, and that keeps it invisible, pervasive, and powerful.

The limitation imposed by viewing marginalization at an individual level may mean that these women high school principals do not perceive a connection with each other by which to resist assimilation. Their practice is expected to obey the imperatives of patriarchy. As in the case of Tess, failure to do so results in further marginalization.

In a masculine discourse, coming-to-know cannot be separated from relations of power between genders. These relations of power and knowledge and gender are expressed in masculinized discourse but serve as the purposeful construction of the culture of the high school principal and of our society in general. Women in the culture of the high school principal do not experience many forms of self-

representation which they have produced themselves, as subjects. Instead, the representations of the feminine gender that have been most available to them are those established by patriarchal culture. This creates a privileging of masculinized discourse. Only when these disparate relations between gender and privilege are noticed and talked about can links be made between gender and domination or gender and subordination. When the link between gender and power is hidden or invisible, it is fixed and is a source of power beyond question. Silence is a voice of repression.

Recommendations for Further Study

The position of women high school principals is defined by patriarchal arrangements within the culture. This culture simplifies varying human responses and human diversity, and difference denied is difference enslaved. Women within the culture of the high school principal need to develop activities that encompass their differences as women. Viewing their marginalization at an individual level may mean that these women high school principals do not perceive a connection with each other. They need to do so. Only by connecting with each other can women resist assimilation and the temptation to be like those in control and, by doing so, claim difference. Strategies

of discourse which silence women's knowledge about the culture of the high school principal help to confirm the invisibility of women.

Women high school principals need to ask questions about what has come to be, whose interests are served by particular organizational arrangements, and from whence frames of reference come. They need to be critical of how the forces of authority affect them as they form and re-form their thinking. They need to examine whose interests are served by ideologically frozen discourses. Those women using masculinist discourses and paradigms need to consider the implications of their own position of privilege over others. Women can become enmeshed by the contradictions, difficult to reconcile, which exist in their jobs and their present social genderization. The structure of educational bureaucracy is still maintained by strategies of discourse which link domination and coherence while silently intertwining power and gender. When research does not examine power and gender, subordination is reinforced for women.

Theory Development and Administrative Practice

Research which intersects with people's self-understandings can provide possibilities for change. Such research can lead to self-reflection and provide the forum for possible emancipatory theory construction. The interaction between theory construction, as such, and administrative practice will further enable people to re-evaluate their own processes and situations.

Women high school principals can retell and analyze their stories to create a discourse for themselves. Then conversations can be moved to more reflective action as cultural explorations are moved to explicit practices. These practices may empower the construction of a new perception which could undermine masculinist assumptions and open to question the dominant discourse. This should be done in colleges in professional preparation programs. This should be done by women high school principals in groups of their own. This should be done through publications of feminist critiques. Collective deconstruction by women high school principals is likely to threaten the entrenched terms of bureaucratic discourse, and the upheaval may contribute to development of some alternatives for practice.

I do not know if I will ever be comfortable with the way I practice my feminist beliefs in my position as a high school principal. However, it is only when my practice is problematic that I am conscious of my resistance to the masculinist discourse. When women who are practicing administrators, like me, do not examine the intersection of power and gender, they may be more promotable within the bureaucracy, but their lack of attention to gender reinforces the dominance of the masculinist discourse of the high school principal. The culture of the high school principal is a rich site for cultural re-examination.

The deconstructing of the dominant masculine discourse will require more research and more discussions that link gender to patterns of practice within the culture of the high school principal as it is grounded in the wider culture. Dominance by men is reinforced and maintained within the culture of the high school principal, in part, because it is a microcosm of the wider culture.

I believe that it is impossible to separate gender and power under our present cultural constructs. However, focusing on notions

of gender enables a way to explore difference and a way to identify privileges and oppressions. As a feminist, I do not favor feminine gender 'power-over,' nor do I seek the abolition of power altogether. I favor considerations of equity to emphasize the possibilities for multivoiced negotiation of difference, involving the seeking of new options which may be, as yet, unarticulated.

Bibliography

Abbott, M. G. (1965). Intervening variables in organizational behavior. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1, 1-14.

Acker, J., Barry, K., & Esserveld, J. (1993). Objectivity and truth. In M. Fonow & J. Cook (Eds.), Beyond methodology (pp. 133-153). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Adler, N. J. & Jelinek, M. (1986). Is "organization culture" culture bound? Human Resource Management, 25, 73-90.

Aggar, B. (1975). On science as domination. In A. Kontos (Ed.), Domination: Essays (pp. 186-200). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Alban-Metcalfe, B. & West, M. (1991). Women managers. In J. Firth-Cozens & M. West (Eds.), Women at work (pp. 154-171). Philadelphia: Open University Press.

American Association of School Administrators. (1982). Climbing the career ladder: A research study of women in school administration. Arlington, VA: National Institute of Education.

Apple, M. (1983). *Work, Class, and Teaching*. In S. Walker & L. Barton (Eds.), Gender, class, and education (pp. 53-68). New York: The Falmer Press.

Apple, M. (1986). Teachers and texts. New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd.

Ardener, S. (Ed.). (1975). Perceiving women. London: Malaby Press.

Argyris, C. (1957). Personality and organization. New York: Harper.

Ayman, R. (1993). Leadership perception: The role of gender and culture. In M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), Leadership theory and research (pp. 137-159). New York: Academic Press.

Balsamo, A. (1985). Beyond female as variable: Constructing a feminist perspective on organizational analysis. Paper presented at the Critical Perspectives in Organizational Analysis Conference, Baruch College.

Balsamo, A. (1987). Un-wrapping the postmodern: A feminist glance. Journal of Communication Inquiry, 11(1), 64-72.

Barnard, C. I. (1974). The functions of the executive. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bates, R. (1984). Toward a critical practice of educational administration. In T. J. Sergiovanni & J. E. Corbally (Eds.), Leadership and organizational culture: New perspectives on administrative theory and practice (pp. 260-279). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Bates, R. (1984). Educational administration and the management of knowledge. Geelong: Deakin University Press.

Bates, R. (1986). Management of culture and knowledge. Geelong: Deakin University Press.

Bates, R. (1988). Evaluating schools: A critical approach. Geelong: Deakin University Press.

Bates, R. (1989). Is there a new paradigm in educational administration? Deakin University, Victoria, Australia. Unpublished paper.

Beck, L. G. (1994). Reclaiming educational administration as a caring profession. New York: Teachers' College Press.

Belenky, M., Clinchy, B., Goldberger, N., & Tarule, J. (1986). Women's ways of knowing: the development of self, voice, and mind. New York: Basic Books.

Bell, C. (1988). Organizational influences of women's experiences in the superintendency. Peabody Journal of Education, 65(4), 31-49.

Benhabib, S. (1992). Situating the self. New York: Routledge.

Benhabib, S., & Cornell, D. (1987). Feminism as critique. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Bennis, W. (1983). The chief. New York: William Morrow Publishers.

Bennis, W. (1989). On becoming a leader. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.

Bennis, W., Benne, K., & Chin, R. (1969). The planning of change. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). Leadership. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Berger, P., & Luckman, T. (1967). The social construction of reality. Garden City, NY: Anchor.

Bielby, W., & Baron, J. (1984). A woman's place is with other women: Sex segregation within organizations. In B. Reskin (Ed.), Sex segregation in the workplace: Trends, explanations, remedies (pp. 27-38). Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Biklen, S. K., & Brannigan, M. B. (1980). Women and educational leadership. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath and Co.

Black, N. (1989). Social feminism. Iaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Blackmore, J. (1989). Educational leadership: A feminist critique and reconstruction. In J. Smyth (Ed.), Critical perspectives on educational leadership (pp. 89-102). London: Falmer Press.

Blackmore, J. (1992). The gendering of skill and vocationalism in twentieth-century Australian education. Journal of Education Policy, 7(4), 351-377.

Blackmore, J. (1993). 'In the shadow of men': The historical construction of educational administration as a 'masculinist' enterprise. In J. Blackmore & J. Kenway (Eds.), Gender matters in educational administration and policy (pp. 27-48). Bristol, PA: Falmer.

Blau, F. D. (1974). On the nature of organizations. New York: Wiley.

Blau, F. D., & Ferber, M. A. (1986). The economics of women, men, and work. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bolough, R. W. (1990). Love or greatness: Max Weber and masculine thinking. London: Hyman.

Bradsher, K. (1988, March 17). Women gain numbers, respect in board rooms. The Los Angeles Times, 1C.

Britan, G. M., & Cohen, R. (Eds.). (1980). Hierarchy and society: Anthropological perspectives on bureaucracy. Philadelphia: Institute for the Study of Human Issues.

Brown, K. (1993). Do African American males need race and gender? In C. Marshall (Ed.), The new politics of race and gender. Washington, DC: Falmer Press.

Bullivant, B. (1981). The pluralist dilemmma in education. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.

Burns, J. M. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Burns, T., & Stalker, G. M. (1961). The management of innovation. London: Tavistock Publications.

Burrell, G. (1984). Sex and organizational analysis. Organizational Studies, 5, 97-118.

Burrell, G. (1988). Modernism, postmodernism, and organizational analysis 2: The contribution of Michel Foucault. Organizational Studies, 9(2), 163-177.

Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). Sociological paradigms and organisational analysis. London: Heinemann.

Caine, B., & Pringle, R. (Eds.). (1995). Transitions: New Australian feminisms. New York: St. Martin Press.

Calder, B. J. (1977). An Attribution Theory of Leadership. In B. M. Shaw & G. R. Salancik (Eds.), New directions in organizational behavior (pp.179-204). Chicago: St. Clair Press.

Callahan, R. E. (1962). Education and the cult of efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Callahan, R. E. (1967). The superintendent of schools: An historical analysis (Final Report of Project S-212). Washington, D.C.: Cooperative Research Branch, USOE, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Carroll, S. (1984). Feminist scholarship on political leadership. In B. Kellerman (Ed.), Leadership: Multidisciplinary approaches (pp. 139-152). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Cherryholmes, C. (1988). Power and criticism: Poststructural investigations in education. New York: Teacher's College Press.

Christiansen-Ruffman, L. (1985). Participation theory and the methodological construction of invisible women: Feminism's call for

appropriate methodology. Journal of Voluntary Action Research, 14, (2 & 3), 94-111.

Christiansen-Ruffman, L. (1986). Sex bias in research: Current awareness and strategies to eliminate bias within Canadian social science. Report of the Task Force on the Elimination of Sexist Bias in Research. Ottawa: Social Science Federation of Canada.

Christiansen-Ruffman, L. (1989). Inherited biases within feminism: The patricentric syndrome and the either/or syndrome in sociology. In R. Miles and G. Finn, (Eds.), Feminism: From pressure to politics (pp. 123-146). Montreal: Black Rose Books.

Clark, D. (1985). Emerging paradigms in organizational theory and research. In Y. S. Lincoln (Ed.), Organizational theory and inquiry: the paradigm revolution (pp. 386-399). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Clegg, S. R. (1979). The theory of power and organization. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Cockburn, C. (1983). Brothers: Male dominance and technological change. London: Pluto Press.

Cockburn, C. (1991). In the way of women. Ithaca, NY: ILR Press.

Conway, J. A. (1985). A perspective on organizational cultures and organizational belief structure. Educational Administration Quarterly, 21, 7-25.

Cooper, R., & Burrell, G. (1988). Modernism, postmodernism, and organizational analysis: An introduction. Organization Studies, 9(1), 91-112.

Cubberly, E. (1916). Public school administration. Cambridge, MA: Riverside Press.

Culley, M., & Portuges, C. (1985). Gendered subjects: The dynamics of feminist teaching. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Daly, M. (1973). Beyond God the father: Toward a philosophy of women's liberation. Boston: Beacon Press.

Daly, M. (1978). Gyn/ecology: The meta-ethics of radical feminism. Boston: Beacon Press.

Daly, M. (1984). Pure lust. London: Women's Press.

Davis, K. (1967). Human relations at work. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Deal, T. E., & Kennedy, A. A. (1982). Corporate cultures: The rites and rituals of corporate life. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.

Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (1994). Handbook of qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

DeVault, M. (1990). Talking and listen from women's standpoint: Feminist strategies for interviewing and analysis. Social Problems, 37(1), 701-721.

Dimon, R., Dippo, D., Schenke, R. (1991). Learning work: A critical pedagogy of work education. New York: Bergin and Garvey.

Donnell, S., & Hall, J. (1980). Men and women as managers: A significant case of no significant difference. Organizational Dynamics, 8(2), 60-76.

Dublin, T. (1979). Women at work. New York: Columbia University Press.

Edson, S. K. (1981). "If they can, I can": Women aspirants to administrative positions in public schools. In P. Schmuck, W. Charters, & R. Carlson (Eds.), Educational policy and management. New York: Academic Press.

Edson, S. K. (1988). Pushing the limits: The female administrative aspirant. New York: State University of New York Press.

Evers, C., & Lakomski, G. (1991). Knowing educational administration. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Fayol, H. (1949). General and industrial management. (C. Storrs, Trans.). London: Pitman Publishers.

Fenn, M. (1976). Comment. Journal of Contemporary Business, 5(4), i-vii.

Fenstermaker, S., West, C., & Zimmerman, D. (1991). Gender inequality. In R. L. Blumberg, (Ed.), Gender, family and economy (pp. 289-307). Newbury Park, NJ: Sage Publications.

Ferguson, K. (1984). The feminist case against bureaucracy. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Ferguson, K. (1988). Knowledge, politics and personhood. Paper presented at the conference for The Feminine in Public Administration and Policy, Washington, D. C.

Ferguson, M. (1981). The aquarian conspiracy: Personal and social transformation in the 1980s. Los Angeles: JP Tarcher.

Ferree, M., & Martin, P. (1995). Feminist organizations. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Fiedler, F. E. (1967). A theory of leadership effectiveness. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co.

Fine, M. (1993). Empowering minority students: A framework for intervention. In L. Weis and M. Fine (Eds.), Beyond silenced voices: Class, race and gender in United States schools (pp. 10-17). New York: State University of New York Press.

Flax, J. (1987). Postmodernism and gender relations in feminist theory. Signs, 12, 621-643.

Flax, J. (1990). Thinking fragments. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Forisha, B. (1978). Sex roles and personal awareness. Morristown, NJ: Learning Press.

Forisha, B. & Goldman, B. (1981). Outsiders on the inside: Women & organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Foster, W. (1986). Paradigms and promises. Buffalo: Prometheus Books.

Foucault, M. (1972). The archaeology of knowledge and discourse on language. New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1973). The order of things. New York: Vintage.

Foucault, M. (1975). The birth of the clinic. New York: Vintage.

Foucault, M. (1977a). Madness and civilisation. London: Tavistock.

Foucault, M. (1977b). The archaeology of knowledge. London: Tavistock.

Foucault, M. (1977c). Discipline and punish. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1979). The history of sexuality (Vol. 1). Harmondsworth, NJ: Penguin.

Freire, P. (1972). Cultural action for freedom. Harmondsworth, NJ: Penguin Books.

Friedman, S. (1985). Authority in the feminist classroom: a contradiction in terms. In M. Culley & C. Portuges (Eds.), Gendered subjects: The dynamics of feminist teaching (pp. 203-208). Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Friesen, L. (1983). Focus on research: Women and leadership. Contemporary Education, 54, 223-230.

Fuchs, D. (1988). Women's quest for economic equality. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Fullian, M. G. (1991). The meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Funk, C. (1988). Career paths and work patterns of women in mid-management roles in business and education. Paper presented at

the Texas Woman's University Conference on Women and Work,
Arlington, TX. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 299 664)

Funow, M. and Cook, J. (1993) Back to the future. In M. Funow
& J. Cook (Eds.), Beyond methodology (pp. 1-15). Bloomington, IN:
Indiana University Press.

Furst, M. (1993). Women in leadership positions: Gender issues
and the reform agenda. (Doctoral dissertation, Fordham University,
1993). Dissertation Abstracts International, 54, AA19412135.

Gergen, M. M. (1988). Toward a feminist metatheory and
methodology in the social sciences. In M. M. Gergen (Ed.), Feminist
thought and the structure of knowledge (pp. 87-104). New York:
New York University Press.

Gergen, M. M. (1990). From theory to practice and back again:
What does postmodern philosophy contribute to psychological
science? The Humanist Psychologist, 18(1), 32-58.

Gergen, K. J., & Gergen, M. M. (1991). Toward reflexive
methodologies. In F. Steier (Ed.), Research and reflexivity (pp. 76-95).
Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Getzels, J. (1958). Administration as a social process. In A. Halpin (Ed.), Administrative theory in education. Chicago: University of Chicago, Midwest Administration Center.

Giddens, A. (1979). New rules of sociological method: A positive critique of interpretative sociologies. New York: Basic Books.

Giddens, A. (1982). Profiles and critiques in social theory. London: Macmillan.

Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Glazer, J. S. (1991). Feminism and professionalism in teaching and educational administration. Educational Administration Quarterly, 27, 321-342.

Goldin, C. (1986). The economic status of women in the early republic: Quantitative evidence. Journal of Interdisciplinary History, 16(4), 375-404.

Goodnow, J., & Pateman, C. (1985). Women, social science, and public policy. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.

Gore, J. (1990). The struggle for pedagogies: Critical and feminist discourses as regimes of truth. (Doctoral dissertation, The

University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1990). Dissertation Abstracts International, 51, AAI9106675.

Graen, G., & Cashman, J. F. (1975). A role-making model of leadership in formal organizations: A developmental approach. In J. G. Hunt and L. Larson (Eds.), Leadership frontiers (pp.140-155). Kent: Kent State University Press.

Graham, H. (1985). Providers, negotiators, and mediators: Women as the hidden carers. In E. Lewin & U. Olesen (Eds.), Women, health and healing: Toward a new perspective. London: Tavistock.

Graham, C. (1986). Managing the public organization. Washington, DC: CQ Press.

Gramsci, A. (1971). Selections from the prison notebooks (Q. Hoare & G. Nowell-Smith, Trans.). New York: International Publishers.

Gramsci, A. (1991). Selections from cultural writings (W. Boelhower, Trans.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Gray, E. D. (1982). Patriarchy as a conceptual trap. Boston: Roundtable Press.

Greenfield, T. B. (1973). Organizations as social inventions: Rethinking assumptions about change. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 9(5), 551-74.

Greenfield, T. B. (1975). Theory about organization: A new perspective and its implications for schools. In M. Hughes (Ed.), Administering education: International challenges (pp. 71-99). London: Athlone Press of the University of London.

Greenfield, W. (1986). Moral imagination, interpersonal competence, and the work of the school administrator. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). Servant leadership. New York: Paulist Press.

Griffiths, D. E. (1956). Human relations in school administration. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Griffiths, D. E. (1959). Administrative theory. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Griffiths, D. E. (1983). Can there be a science in organizations? In G. S. Johnson and C. C. Yeakey (Eds.), Research and thought in administrative theory: Developments in the field of education administration (pp. 133-145). Washington DC: University Press of America.

Grob, L. (1984). "Leadership: The socratic model." In B. Kellerman (Ed.), Leadership: Multidisciplinary perspectives (pp. 263-280). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Gross, E. (1986). Philosophy, subjectivity, and the body: Kristeva and Irigaray. In C. Pateman & E. Gross (Eds.), Feminist challenges: Social and political theory (pp. 125-143). Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Grundy, S. (1987). Curriculum: Product or praxis? London: Falmer Press.

Grundy, S. (1993). Educational leadership as emancipatory practice. In J. Blackmore & J. Kenway (Eds.), Gender matters in educational administration and policy (pp. 165-180). London: The Falmer Press.

Guba, E. (1985). The context of emergent paradigm research. In Y.S. Lincoln (Ed.), Organizational theory and inquiry: the paradigm revolution (pp. 96-112). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Guba, E., and Lincoln, Y. (1981). Effective evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Limited.

Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (1989). Fourth generation evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gutek, B. A. (1985). Sex and the workplace: Impact of sexual behavior and harassment on women, men, and organizations. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Habermas, J. (1972). Knowledge and human interests. (J. Shapiro, Trans.). Boston: Beacon Press.

Halpin, A. W. (1966). Theory and research in administration. New York: The Macmillan Co.

Hamilton, D. (1976). A science of the singular. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois.

Harragan, B. (1977). Games mother never taught you. New York: Rawson Associates Publishers, Inc.

Hearn, J., & Parkin, W. (1983). Gender and organizations: A selective review and a critique of a neglected area. Organization Studies, 3, 219-242.

Hearn, J., & Parkin, W. (1986). Women, men, and leadership: A critical view of assumptions, practices, and change in the industrialized nations. International Studies of Management and Organization, 16, 33-60.

Hearn, J., & Parkin, W. (1987). Sex at work. Brighton, UK: Wheatsheaf Books.

Helgesen, S. (1990). The female advantage: Women's ways of leadership. New York: Doubleday.

Heller, T. (1982). Women and men as leaders: In business, educational, and social service organizations. New York: Praeger.

Hennig, M., & Jardim, A. (1976). The managerial woman. New York: Simon & Schuster, Inc.

Herbert, S. (1945). The technique of municipal administration. Chicago: Institute for Training in Municipal Administration.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1988). Management of organizational behavior. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Herzberg, F. (1966). Work and the nature of man. New York: The World Publishing Co.

Holland, N. J. (1990). Is women's philosophy possible? Savage, MD: Rowand & Littlefield Pub.

Hornstein, H. A. (1986). Managerial courage: Revitalizing your company without sacrificing your job. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Hudson, M. B. (1993). Feminine understandings of power and the culture of the school. (Doctoral dissertation, University of North

Carolina at Greensboro, 1993). Dissertation Abstracts International, 54, AAI9402482.

Hunt, J. (1988). Organizational leadership: The contingency paradigm and its challenges. In B. Kellerman (Ed.), Leadership: Multidisciplinary perspectives (pp. 113-138). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Hutton, S. I. (1992). Leadership communication: Examination of gender differences in the social control communication of principals as perceived by Hutton. (Doctoral dissertation, Washington State University, 1992). Dissertation Abstracts International, 54, AAI9402482.

Hymowitz, C., & Schellhardt, T. (1986, March 24). The glass ceiling. The Wall Street Journal, p. D1.

In the Supreme Court of the United States. (1991). Price-Waterhouse v Ann B. Hopkins. Amicus curiae brief for the American Psychological Association. American Psychologist, 46, 1061-1070.

Irigaray, L. (1993). Toward a culture of difference. London: Routledge.

Jacobs, J. (1989). Revolving doors. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Jaggar, A. (1983). Feminist politics and human nature. Totawa, NJ: Rowman & Allanheld.

Jago, A. G. (1983). Leadership: Perspectives in theory and research. Management Science, 3, 315-336.

Jardim, A., & Hennig, M. (1990). The last barrier: Breaking into the boys' club at the top. Working Woman, 164, 131-134.

Jayarathne, E., & Stewart, A. (1993) Quantitative and qualitative methods in the social sciences: Current feminist issues and practical strategies. In M. Fonow & J. Cook (Eds.), Beyond methodology (pp. 85-106). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Jones, E. H., & Montenegro, R. P. (1982). Recent trends in the representation of women and minorities in school administration and problems of documentation. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators, Educational Resources Information Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 226 416)

Jones, E. H., & Montenegro, R. P. (1985). Women and minorities in school administration. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators, Educational Resources Information Center. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 273 301)

Jones, E. H., & Montenegro, K. P. (1990). Women and minorities in school administration: facts and figures 1989-1990. Arlington, VA: The Association of School Administrators.

Jones, G. R. (1986). Socialization tactics, self-efficacy, and new-comers' adjustments to organizations. Academy of Management Journal, 29, 262-279.

Jones, M. H. (1992). A study of the influence strategies used by principals of distinguished schools (Doctoral dissertation, University of La Verne, 1992). Dissertation Abstracts International, 53, AAI9238595.

Jones, S. W. (1987). Women administrators: The myths don't match the facts. CUPA Journal, 38(1), 1-4.

Kahn, W., & Crosby, F. (1985). Discriminating between attitudes and discriminatory behaviors." In L. Larwood, A. Stromberg, & B. Guteck (Eds.), Women and work (pp. 215-238). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Kanter, R. M. (1975). Women in organizations: Sex roles, group dynamics, and change strategies. In A. Sargent (Ed.), Beyond sex roles (pp. 82-94). St. Paul, MN: West.

Kanter, R. M. (1977). Men and women of the corporation. New York: Basic Books.

Kanter, R. M. (1981). Structuring the inside: The impact in organizations of sex differences." In B. Forisha & B. Goldman (Eds.), Outsiders on the inside (pp. 75-85). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall Books.

Kanter, R. M. (1982). The impact of hierarchical structures on the work behavior of women and men." In R. Daniels, R. Colvard, & R. Kahn-Hut (Eds.), Women and work (pp. 234-247). New York: Oxford University Press.

Korda, M. (1976). Power! London: Coronet Books.

Kuhn, T. (1970). The structure of scientific revolutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lao-Tzu. (1944). The way of life. (W. Bynner, Trans.). New York: Capricorn Books.

Lather, P. (1986). Issues of validity in openly ideological research: Between a rock and a soft place. Interchange 17(4), 63-74.

Lather, P. (1991). Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy within the postmodern. London: Routledge.

Leck, G. M. (1990). Examining gender as a foundation within foundational studies. Teachers College Record 91(3), 382-395.

Lightfoot, S. (1983). The good high school: Portraits of character and culture. New York: Basic Books.

Lincoln, Y. S. (1985) Organizational theory and inquiry: The paradigm revolution. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Lindblom, C., & Cohen, D. (1979). Usable knowledge: Social science and social problem solving. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Loden, M. (1985). Feminine leadership or how to succeed in business without being one of the boys. New York: Times Books.

Loden, M. (1991). Workforce America: managing employee diversity as a vital resource. Homewood, IL: Business One Irwin.

Lombard, G. F. (1980). Retrospective comment. In L. Boone & D. Bowen (Eds.), The great writings in management and organization (pp. 70-72). Tulsa: PPC Books.

Luke, C. (1989). Feminist politics in radical pedagogy. In C. Luke & J. Gore (Eds.), Feminisms and critical pedagogy (pp. 25-53). New York: Routledge.

Luke, C., and Gore, J. (1992). Feminisms and critical pedagogy. New York: Routledge Publishers.

Mahoney, P. (1988). **Oppressive pedagogy: The importance of process in women's studies.** Women's Studies International Forum **11(2)**, 103-108.

Mannheim, K. (1936). Ideology and utopia. New York: Harcourt, Brace.

Marcuse, H. (1964). One-dimensional man. Boston: Beacon Press.

Marcuse, H. (1971). **Industrialization and capitalism** (K. Morris, Trans.). In O. Stamme (Ed.), Max Weber and sociology today (pp. 133-170). Oxford: Blackwell.

Marshall, C. (1985). **Professional shock: The enculturation of the assistant principal.** Education and Urban Society, **18**, 28-58.

Marshall, C. (1988). **Analyzing the culture of school leadership.** Education and Urban Society, **20**, 262-275.

Marshall, C. (Ed.). (1993). The new politics of race and gender. Washington, DC: The Falmer Press.

Marshall, C., & Mitchell, B. (1989). Women's careers as a critique of the administrative culture. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 307 675)

Marshall, C., & Mitchell, B. (1991). The assumptive worlds of fledgling administrators. Education and Urban Society, 23, 347-355.

Marshall, J. (1986). Towards rigour in qualitative methods. In S. Wilkinson & M. Keynes (Eds.), Feminist social psychology: Developing theory and practice (pp. 93-102). Buckingham: Open University Press.

Marshall, J. (1989). Re-visioning career concepts: A feminist invitation. In M. Arthur, D. Hall, & B. Lawrence (Eds.), Handbook of career theory (pp. 275-291). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Martin, J. (1984). Bringing women into educational thought. Educational Theory 34(4), 341-353.

Martin, J. (1985). Reclaiming a conversation. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Martin, J. (1987). The woman in the body. Boston: Beacon.

Martin, J. (1990). Deconstructing organizational taboos: The suppression of gender conflict in organizations. Organizational Science, 1, 339-359.

Martin, B., & Mohanty, C. (1986). Feminist politics: What's home got to do with it? In T. deLauretis (Ed.), Feminist

studies/Critical studies (pp. 116-134). Bloomington: University of Indiana Press.

Mayo, E. (1933). The human problems of an industrial civilization. New York: The Macmillan Co.

Mayes, S. (1979). Women in positions of authority: A case of changing sex roles. Signs, 4, 556-568.

McGregor, D. (1960). The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Mies, M. (1983). Towards a methodology for feminist research. In G. Bowles & R. Klein, (Eds.), Theories of women's studies (pp.117-139). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Mies, M. (1991). Women's research or feminist research? The debate surrounding feminist science and methodology. In M. Funow & J. Cook (Eds.), Beyond methodology (pp. 60-84). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Mills, J. (1988). Organization, gender and culture. Organizational Studies 9(3), 351-369.

Miller, E. M. (1986). Street woman. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Mohanty, C. (1984). Under Western eyes: Feminist scholarship and colonial discourse. Boundary, 2(12-13): 333-358.

Moore, L. (1986). Not so far as you think. Lexington: Lexington Books.

Morgan, G. (1980). Paradigms, metaphors, and puzzle solving in organization theory. Administrative Science Quarterly, 25, 605-622.

Morgan, G. (Ed.). (1983). Beyond method: Strategies for social research. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Morgan, G. (1986). Images of organization. London: Sage.

Morrison, A., & Don Glinow, M.A. (1990). Women and minorities in management. American Psychologist, 45, 200-208.

Morrison, T. (1992). Playing in the dark: Whiteness and literary imagination. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Mumby, D. K. (1988). Communication and power in organizations: Discourse, ideology, and domination. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Pub.

Neville, M. (1988). Promoting women. Auckland: Longman Paul.

Noddings, N. (1984). Caring. Berkley: University of California Press.

Oakley, A. (1972). Sex, gender, and society. London: Temple Smith.

Oakley, A. (1981). Interviewing women: A contradiction in terms. In H. Roberts (Ed.), Doing feminist research (pp. 30-61). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Oakley, M. A. (1993). Women creating spaces: Feminist practice in an institution (Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, 1993). Dissertation Abstracts International, 54, AA1NN82704.

O'Brien, M. (1981). The politics of reproduction. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Ohio educational directory. (1994). Columbus: Ohio Department of Education.

Ortiz, F. I. (1982). Career patterns in education. New York: Praeger Press.

Oseen, C. A. (1993). Women, men, words, and power: A feminist/postmodernist reconceptualization of organizational theory as it pertains to the organizational newcomer (Doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, 1993). Dissertation Abstracts International, 54, AA1NN81974.

Oskamp, S. & Costanzo, M. (1993). Gender issues in contemporary society. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Pub.

Ozga, J. (1993). Women in educational management. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Pagano, J. (1990). Exiles and communities: Teaching in the patriarchal wilderness. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Parson, T. (Ed). (1947). Max Weber: The theory of social and economic organization. (A. Henderson & T. Parsons, Trans.). New York: Free Press.

Pateman, C., & Gross, E. (Eds.). (1986). Feminist challenges: Social and political theory. Boston: Northeastern University.

Pavan, B. N. (1985). Certified but not hired: Women administrators in Pennsylvania. Paper presented at the Research on Women in Education Conference, San Francisco, CA.

Pavan, B. N. (1987). Mentoring certified aspiring and incumbent female and male public school administrators. Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership, 7(4), 318-331.

Pavan, B. N. (1991). Principal change facilitator styles and the implementation of instructional support teams. Paper presented at

the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Pavan, B. N. (1994). Effective urban elementary schools and their women administrators. Urban Education, 28(4), 425-438.

Perrow, C. (1972). Complex organizations. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman, and Co.

Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H. (1982). In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best-run companies. New York: Harper & Row.

Pettigrew, A. (1979). On studying organizational cultures. Administrative Science Quarterly, 24, 570-581.

Pfeffer, J. (1982). Organizations and organization theory. Boston: Pitman.

Pigford, A., & Tonnsen, S. (1993). Women in school leadership. Lancaster, PA: Technomic Publishers.

Pitner, N. (1985). Structured observation of school administrator work activities: Methodological limitations and recommendations for research. Educational Research Quarterly, 10(2), 13-24.

Presthus, R. (1964). Men at the top. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Presthus, R. (1978). The organizational society. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Pringle, R. (1990). Fathers, brothers, mates: The fraternal state in Australia. In S. Watson (Ed.), Playing the state: Australian feminist interventions (pp. 229-243). London: Verso.

Ramos, A. G. (1981). The new science of organizations: A reconceptualization of the wealth of nations. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Regan, H. (1990). Not for women only: School administration as a feminist activity. Teachers College Record (5), 37-42.

Reiger, K. (1989). The disenchantment of the home: Modernizing the Australian family, 1880-1940. New York: Oxford University Press.

Reiger, K. (1993). The gender dynamics of organizations: A historical account. In J. Blackmore & J. Kenway (Eds.), Gender matters in educational administration and policy (pp. 17-26). London: The Falmer Press.

Reinharz, S. (1992). Feminist methods in social research. New York: Oxford University Press.

Reskin, B., & Hartmann, H. (1986). Women's work, men's work. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.

Restine, L. N. (1993). Women in administration. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin.

Rich, A. (1985). Taking women students seriously. In Gendered subjects: The dynamics of feminist teaching (pp. 21-28). Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Rich, A. (1993). In B. Gelpi & A. Gelpi (Eds.), Adrienne Rich's poetry and prose: Poems, prose, reviews, and criticism New York: Norton.

Rizvi, F. (1985). Multiculturalism as an educational policy. Victoria: Deakin University Press.

Rizvi, F. (1989). Bureaucratic rational and the promise of democratic school. In W. Carr (Ed.). Quality in schooling (pp. 28-42). London: Falmer Press.

Rizvi, F. (1993). Teachers and the contradictions of culturalism. In G. Derma (Ed.), Equity and teachers education (pp. 144-164). London: Falmer Press.

Rosaldo, M. (1974). Women, culture, and society: A theoretical overview. In R. Kahn-Hut, A. Daniels, & R. Colvard (Eds.), Women, culture, and society (pp. 17-42). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Roszak, T. (1969). The making of a counterculture. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Roszak, B., & Roszak, T. (Eds.). (1969). Masculine/Feminine: Readings in sexual mythology and the liberation of women. New York: Harper Colophon Books.

Rytina, N., & Bianchi, S. (1984). Occupational reclassification and changes in distribution by gender. Monthly Labor Review, 107, 11-17.

Schaef, A. W. (1985). Women reality: An emerging female system in a white male society. San Francisco: Perennial Library.

Schein, E. H. (1990). Organizational culture. American Psychologist, 45(2), 109-119.

Schein, D. E. (1973). Relationships between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics. Journal of Applied Psychology, 57(2), 95-100.

Schein, U. E. (1975). Relationships between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics among female managers. Journal of Applied Psychology, 60(3), 340-344.

Schein, U. E. (1976). Think manager--think male. The Atlanta Economic Review, March-April.

Schein, U. E. (1985). Organizational culture and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Schmuck, P. & Wyant, S. (1981). Clues to sex bias in the selection of school administrators: A report from the Oregon network. In P. Schmuck, W. Charters, & R. Carlson (Eds.), Educational policy and management (pp. 73-98). New York: Academic Press.

Schmuck, P. (1987). Women educators: Employees of schools in Western countries. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Schmuck, R. (1970). Bringing parents and students into school management: A new program of research and development on organizational development. Education and Urban Society, 6, 205-221.

Scott, J. (1986). Gender: A useful category of historical analysis. American Historical Review, 91, 1053-1075.

Scott, J. (1988). Deconstructing equality-versus-difference: Or, the uses of poststructuralist theory for feminism. Feminist Studies, 14, 1.

Scott, W. R. (1987). Organizations: Rational, natural, and open systems. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Selznick, P. (1957). Leadership in administration. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Sergiovanni, T. (1992). Moral leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Shakeshaft, C. (1981). Women in educational administration: A descriptive analysis of dissertation research and a paradigm for future research. In Schmuck, P., Charters, W., and Carlson, R. (Eds.), Educational policy and management (pp. 9-30). New York: Academic Press.

Shakeshaft, C. (1986a). A female organizational culture. Educational Horizons, 64(3), 117-122.

Shakeshaft, C. (1986b). A gender at risk. Phi Delta Kappan, 67, 499-503.

Shakeshaft, C. (1989). Women in educational administration. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Sheppard, D. L. (1989). Organizations, power and sexuality: The image and self-image of women managers. In J. Hearn, D. Sheppard, P. Tancred-Sheriff, & G. Burrell (Eds.), The sexuality of organization (pp. 139-157). London: Sage.

Simon, R., & Dippo, D. (1986). On critical ethnographic work. Anthropology and Education Quarterly, 17(4): 195-202.

Smircich, L. (1983). Concepts of culture and organizational analysis. Administrative Science Quarterly, 28, 414-437.

Smircich, L. (1985). Is the concept of culture a paradigm for understanding organizations and ourselves? In P. Frost, L. Moore, M. Louis, C. Lundberg, & J. Martin (Eds.). Organizational culture (pp.55-72). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Smith, D. E. (1974). The ideological practice of sociology. Catalyst 8, 39-54.

Smith, D. E. (1978). A peculiar eclipsing: Women's exclusion from man's culture. Women's Studies International Quarterly, 1(4), 281-295.

Smith, D. E. (1987). The everyday world as problematic. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Smith, D. E. (1990). The conceptual practices of power: A feminist sociology of knowledge. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Smith, R. E. (1979). The subtle revolution: Women at work. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Sotirin, P. (1984). Organizational culture--A focus on contemporary theory/research in organizational communication. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 252 892)

Sotirin, P. (1987a). The good man speaks: A rhetorical analysis of the charismatic organizational leader. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Speech Communication Association, Salt Lake City. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 280 092)

Sotirin, P. (1987b). Rethinking the organizational culture approach. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Boston. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 290 186)

Spence, J. (1993). Women, men, and society. In S. Oskamp & M. Costanzo, (Eds.), Gender issues in contemporary psychology (pp. 3-18). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Spender, D. (1981a). Man made language. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Spender, D. (1981b). Men's studies modified: The impact of feminism on the academic disciplines. New York: Pergamon Press.

Spivak, G. C. (1987). In other worlds: Essays in cultural politics. New York: Methurn.

Stake, R. (1982). Naturalistic generalization. Review Journal of Philosophy and Social Science, 7(1-2), 1-12.

Stake, R. (1991). Retrospective on "The countenance of educational evaluation." In M.W. McLaughlin & D.C. Phillips (Eds.), Evaluation and education: At quarter century (pp. 67-88). Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Stanley, L., & Wise, S. (1983). Breaking out: Feminist consciousness and feminist research. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Stoghill, R. (1974). Handbook of leadership. New York: The Free Press.

Sumner, H. (1974). History of women in industry in the United States. New York: Arno Press.

Taylor, F. (1929). Principles of scientific management. New York: Harper and Row Publishers.

Tetreault, M. (1984). Stages of thinking about women: An evaluation model. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Tetreault, M. (1987). The scholarship on women and teacher education. Teacher Education Quarterly, 14(2), 77-83.

Thompson, J. D. (1967). Organizations in action. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Thompson, U. (1961). Modern organization. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.

Trujillo, N. (1983). "Performing" Mintzberg's roles: the nature of managerial communication. In L. Putnam & M. Pacanowsky (Eds.), Communication and organizations: An interactive approach (pp. 73-98). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Tucker, R. (1981). Politics as leadership. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press.

Tyack, D. B. & Hansot, E. (1982). Managers of virtue: Public school leadership in America, 1820-1980. New York: Basic Books.

United States Department of Education. (1994). Digest of education statistics. Washington, D.C.: United States Printing Office.

Droom, U. (1975). A new look at managerial decision-making. In M. Wortman and F. Luthers (Eds.), Emerging concepts in management (pp. 120-145). New York: The Macmillan Co.

Weber, M. (1947). The theory of social and economic organization. (R. M. Henderson and T. Parsons, Trans.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Weber, M. (1968). Economy and society. An outline of interpretive sociology. (Vol. 3). G. Roth and C. Wittich (Eds. and Trans.). New York: Bedminster.

Weedon, C. (1987). Feminist practice and poststructuralist theory. New York: Basil Blackwell.

Weick, K. (1979). The social psychology of organizing. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Weis, L., & Fine, M. (1993). Beyond silenced voices: Class, race, and gender in United States schools. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Wells, T. (1973). The covert power of gender in organizations. Journal of Contemporary Business, 2, 53-68.

West, C., & Zimmerman, D. (1987). Doing gender. Gender and Society, 1, 125-151.

Whyte, W. H. (1956). The organizational man. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Wiles, J., & Bondi, J. (1983). Principles of school administration. Columbus: Merrill Publishing Co.

Wilkinson, S. (Ed.). (1986). Feminist social psychology. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Wilkinson, S. (1991). Why psychology (badly) needs feminism. In J. Aaron & S. Walby (Eds.), Out of the margins (pp. 191-203). Portsmouth, UK: The Falmer Press.

Wolcott, H. F. (1973). The man in the principal's office: An ethnography. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Wolff, J. (1977). Women in organizations. In S. Clegg and D. Dunkerley (Eds.), Critical issues in organizations (pp. 7-20). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Wittig, M. (1980). The straight mind. Feminist Issues, 1(1), 103-111.

Wolf, F. A. (1981) Taking the quantum leap. New York: Harper & Row.

Yeakey, C. C., Johnson, G. S., & Adkinson, J. (1986). In pursuit of equity: A review of research on minorities and women in educational administration. Educational Administration Quarterly, 22(3), 110-149.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

Lucy

H. We have to summarize real briefly what you have told me already. You came in 1977 as the assistant principal out of counseling--right? You were principal here in 1989. Your story was about another person making a comment to you about taking bread out of the mouth of a man when you took the assistant principal's job. Right?

L. Right. Out of the mouth of his family. He's since retired.

H. Okay. He's since retired.

L. He's gone. He's out of the picture.

H. All right. So, you had the ninth graders for the first year.

L. I had the ninth graders my first year. And then I think the second year I had those same ninth graders in tenth grade. And maybe a part of ninth grade--I think I had tenth graders and a part of ninth grade and someone else had it and then it was the next year I just kind of like said, "You know, it's time for us to make a change in how we do this because you're getting beat up your first year there." The first year person whoever [disciplines] your ninth graders are just getting beaten to death. So we made some changes and I think we either went alphabetically--I can't remember--or we may rotated it. But up until about 1986 or something like that--one principal who was called the curriculum coordinator had only seniors the other two principals had the ninth, tenth and eleventh graders. That's why we flipped-flopped--that's why we went one then the other. But now we don't even do that. We just do it strictly alphabetically.

H. When you've had to deal with kids--describe how you deal with them. What do you think your dealings with them were like? They would describe you as--?

L. Some kids would tell you she is fair. Some kids would tell you strong but fair. Some kids would say she is really a bitch. That's the way it goes. But I think most kids would say to you that she is caring,

that she listens to what we say, that she really doesn't pass judgment on us until she's heard our side of the story, that sometimes staff members don't like that. But I think most kids that you deal with would say to you that I listen to what they have to say. I really do. Unless even if I have a story I always get their side of it before I make a decision on what is going to happen to them. And they know too that I am going to tell them up front what is going to happen to them. I'm going to be very, very open with them. If it is suspension, I'm going to say it up front. If it is some other kind of discipline-- whatever the discipline is--I'm going to say it to them up front. I'm not going to tell them one thing and then tell their parents something else or do something differently than they know right up front what's going to happen. I think most people tell you that if they deal with me.

H. What about kids in general? How do you deal with the kids now that you are in a different kind of a role where you're not the front line?

L. I still deal with them a lot the same way. I don't get to write discipline a lot. I don't have to do a lot of that. But there are times I still discipline kids. Most kids I deal with now are those who come in because they feel they've been wronged by the assistant principal or something like that. And those are the ones that I either sit down and talk with and try to figure out why they feel they've been wronged and try to show them why they haven't. I still kind of deal with kids the same. I don't deal with them any differently except I don't deal with as many. I do have to be a little bit tougher than what I've been before. Because there are certain kinds of expectations that I have that I have to stress to them so I am a little bit--I'm probably more firm with them than I was as an assistant principal, even. And I'd have to take that as one of the things that I've probably learned to be--learned to be a little bit tougher on them than what I was as an assistant principal.

H. So it's an appeal procedure. When they appeal it they come to you.

L. Yeah, when they appeal they come to me.

H. And then they would go to the superintendent after that.

L. Right.

H. Did they even do that in a school like this?

L. Not for discipline. It's amazing. I don't think I've even had any appeals for discipline. I've appeals for outside activities and things like that but not discipline. I've had people appeal-uh, I had one this year who appealed a suspension because of a fight before a football game--Homecoming--that kind of thing. Those are the kind of appeals that go to the superintendent. But very few-- I don't know of any appeals that's gone to the superintendent because the student felt they were wronged in terms of a suspension because of behavior problem. I don't think we've even gotten that far. Most of the time when the suspension comes to me or when an appeal comes to me because a kid has been suspended by the assistant principal. Usually we work it out with the parents so they don't have to go any further, as a rule.

H. You have a handbook which kind of delineates this and this and this and this?

L. Oh we have code of conduct. We have our code of conduct that every kid gets at the beginning of the school year. We also have some policies. We have board policies that dictates certain kinds of things. And we try to follow those. Then after that, beyond that, it's your own call.

H. It is your own call?

L. Yeah.

H. You don't have a tiered [code of conduct]? If you do this the first time, this is what happens? If you do this a second time, this is what happens?

L. No. We have rules for certain kinds of things. The fighting-- there are suspensions, for truancies, for tardies, for threats and those kinds of things. There are certain kinds of things that says suspended. It doesn't give you the number of days of the suspension or anything

like that. It gives you a suspension, or it's an expellable offense or something like that. But in terms of how you go about doing the next if you do it for the first time, the second time you have to be suspended, you may get--it doesn't say that. It's left up to the building for us to decide. And we do have some procedures which we use if we suspend you for the first time, maybe three days. Next time maybe five days, depending on what the offense is, or something like that.

H. But that's your call.

L. That's our call.

H. Are you comfortable with that? Do you like it that way?

L. I like it.

H. That must be the way you like it.

L. I really like it. I'd hate to have anybody tell me after the third time that they'd have to be suspended. I'd hate that.

H. Why?

L. I really don't think--because I don't think all the kids--no matter what the rules are--I know you have rules. But I think every rule that you have there are some circumstances that cause you to want to move away a little bit from that. And some kids don't deserve that. Other kids do. And I think teachers it's very difficult for teachers to understand that. Because teachers want everything laid out for them in black and white and they want it to be this way. No matter what the circumstances are they want the same treatment for every kid. And sometimes you can't. There are kids you just cannot. Now fighting is one thing. I understand that. On the other hand there are some kinds of things that happens to kids. There are reasons why it happens to them. If you can find out the root of the reasons, sometimes you can kind of settle it without doing it. If you can get to a parent sometimes you can get away with suspending the same two kids the same amount of time. Something like that.

H. So you see a lot of different shades, not black and white. Tell me about how's the leadership structure in this school? And then overall in the district. How do you work with your assistants, let's say, with the teachers?

L. In this building, the buck stops in this office. That's where it is. So but we try to do it in a team approach. Even though everybody in this building knows that the final say or the final--if you've got to appeal or whatever you want to do, it stops here. But we do try to do things, at least I try to do things, from a team approach because I think it's only right. That's the way I wanted to be treated when I was an assistant principal. I wanted to have some say in what went on in this building, and I try to treat my assistant principals the same way, so that they have some say about what is going on, and I'm just not telling them this is the way it's going to be today or tomorrow or whatever. However, we usually sit down and discuss what is going to happen, and if it isn't going the way I think it can go, if I can see where some of the things they are saying is not workable, I'll say that. I'll just say up front where I don't think this is going to work, and I'll give them a reason why I don't think it's going to work. So I try to do it from a team approach. And I think with the new superintendent, we have that kind of feeling from the top down in the system now. I'm not sure we've always had that. But from this particular superintendent--his comment to me was, "I want you to run this school. And if you can't, if you need some help, tell me what you need and I will be there to help you. I'm here to assist you. I'm not here to run that school. That's your job to run it. And I don't want to be called in to run it. I don't want you to think that. You take care of the school. If you need some help, let me know what you need, and I'll provide that assistance to you." And I think that's great. Cause I really think that's the way it should be. So I'm very comfortable with that. Teachers, on the other hand, aren't always that comfortable with that cause they have not yet learned. And we've been going through a process for about the last three years, particularly with staff, trying to get them to do just that, to get them to understand they are important. They play a big role in what happens at [Anyschool]. And right now, for example, we are in the process of changing our master schedule in terms of time. We may go to block schedule. We may go to--and we just introduced that to them last week. We introduced to them a month ago, really, and then

last week we did a two hour kind of in-service with them just getting it through their heads they really do have--that what they're going to say is important. That they really are going to do this scheduling themselves--they are going to have a major part to do in this whole thing. And I think that some of the feedback we've gotten is that they are beginning to think, "We are important--that we are really going to have something to do with this. That no one is going to sit down and do the scheduling and say here it is." That they really are going to have it, and I think they finally are coming around that they do have some say in some things that are happening at [Anyschool].

H. You've gotten to just direct school renewal. No holds barred. No financial restrictions on this. How would you do that? Anything you want.

L. How would I restructure schools if I had to?

H. You can design your own place to be. You get to be the boss.

L. An ideal setting, huh? If I had to do it from an ideal point of view, I would make it more child-oriented. I really kind of think staff members believe schools are for them. I really think that teachers believe that's what it's for. Rather than the other way. I know it's a work place, but teachers really believe that it's a work place that's built around them rather than around kids. And I really believe that schools should fit the needs of the kids in the community in which they serve. And I don't think we do that. I think we structure schools to fit the needs of a particular groups of kids, and we make everyone else fit into that. And I'm not sure we can fit the needs of every kid, but if I had an ideal setting I'd try and do that. Which means that some kids would come to school three hours a day if they needed to. Some other kids would come to school all day long if they needed to. It depends on what kids could come to school all day. There are kids who could stay in school seven or eight hours a day, no problem. There are other kids who can't come to school, should not come to school, but more than three to four hours a day. And they should be out doing something else. And whatever that is I think we should structure a school to do that, and I think that we'd have--discipline wouldn't be a problem, wouldn't be an issue for us, because we would be able to take care of those kids who are just really bored. Some of

them are bored. Some of them just actually cannot handle that. Unless we would be able to change some of the ways we teach school. We still teach school the ways that were taught twenty, thirty years ago. That isn't the way kids learn anymore. We all know that our kids do not learn the same, but we still expect them to--at least the average teacher still expects them to. One of the things I'd probably do is give teachers a buy-out at the time they had twenty years in the business, and I'd tell them to go find themselves another job. I'd be like the Army. If you're here twenty years, you can retire. Go find yourselves another job or something else to do because you aren't meeting the needs of our kids at twenty years because the kids that are coming in to you with a whole different frame of reference, and you coming from that same unwillingness to change. So that's some of the things I would do, and I'd keep schools open all day and all night. I would keep them open twenty-four hours a day. I'd make school like a factory probably. But not like a factory in terms of production, but I'd keep it open all the time. Cause I think there's a lot--I think part of the reason our kids get into trouble is that they have no place to go. But that would take money. And like you said I have no holds barred. I would be able to spend it pretty well.

H. Until midnight? Someone could wander in and take calculus class or whatever?

L. Not wander in, but I think you could be scheduled in.

H. For those who can't sleep at night.

L. There are kids--there are kids who are like we are--who are like adults. We really don't--don't take advantage of that. There are kids who learn best at nine o'clock at night. And we think they all have to learn from seven, you know at [Anyschool], they all have to learn between seven and three. And then they shut down after three o'clock. If it were me, I probably wouldn't come to school until seven o'clock at night.

H. What would be the curriculum in your ideal school?

L. A lot of the things we would offer--I would probably do a lot more things with technology than what we do now in the school I have

because we don't do a lot. We have one lab. I think I'd open it up to every classroom with computers. I'd do a school on communication cause I think a lot of our kids are interested in that. I'd see some schools--some school on law, some things like that, that kids are really going to go into when they leave the high school. You know we are still doing English, math, science, social studies, the traditional way. But I think we could do all those things if we geared our schools to what kinds of things kids really wanted. I'd set a school for law, for example, for kids who wanted to get into it, let them get a little bit of what law's about. Kids who want to go into performing arts, I'd have a campus for those kids on campus--a small school for those kids. Other kids who want to go into medicine. You know I'd set up some laboratories for those kids. And things like that. And I think we'd probably reach more of our kids than right now what we are doing with the traditional way we teach school. That's what I would like to see done.

H. So what do you think is the purpose of school today? Should be [the purpose]?

L. I think the purpose of school today should be to give our kids a head start on what they are going to be doing in life. I think that's what we should be doing. We should gear everything we have to give them so when they leave a high school--whatever their plans are, and I know kids change their minds, but whatever their plans are so they can go into that without having to do remedial work. I really--I think it's so foolish for us to put out, for parents or for anybody, to put in four years of high school and then have them go off to college and have to be remediated because they haven't gotten what they needed in a high school, or what they want to do. And I think the schools should provide that, and I really believe a lot of schools can provide it if we just take a look at what we are doing and where we are spending our money. We just have not decided yet, as communities and as Boards of Education, we have not decided that the future lies in giving our kids a good head start. We still believe because we went to school twenty-five, thirty years ago that English, math, science, social studies, taught the way it was, was fine. It was. It was fine for me, but I don't think it's fine for the generation of kids we have coming today who have to compete.

H. What about kids that want to be--what about a girl that wants to be a mom? What are you going to do for her?

L. Well, I mean, this place is for those kids, I think, too. In school we offer courses for those kids who want to be moms, and who want to be a good one. Teach them how to be a good mother. Teach them how to do that and you won't have, and I think we owe it to them, to teach them how to be good parents. There's a course, there's courses kids can take to teach them to be good parents, and I think that because everyone doesn't want to go be doctors and lawyers. But those people are just as important. So I think we should be able to offer them something in a regular school, in a regular every day school for those kids. Right now we offer very little. I offer very little here at [Anyschool]. We offer some home ec courses. We offer a GRADS course here and there, but we really don't offer a lot for these kids. And that's why we turn out some kids some time that aren't so good at mothering. And there are kids who want to be that. But they're afraid to even say it. They really are. They're even afraid to say, "I don't want to do anything." So we have kids out here saying I want to go to college, and you know darned well they don't want to go to college. They just don't want to say "I want to be a mom" because we have nothing to offer them.

H. But would you have requirements at all? You say everyone's going to take math?

L. Yes, I think so.

H. You still do this?

L. Yes, I would think so. I'd still have--I'd have math. I'd have it built into a--if you were going to go into--whatever field you were, you could get some math that's oriented to whatever you were going to do. Math, like if you were going to go into business, take business math. If you are going to go into communications, there's business math or whatever you are going to do. I think there's a way to do math and there's a way that you can get the math you need if you use in almost any subject. But you have to do a lot of collaboration in your teaching. You couldn't teach anymore any particular subject isolated one-on-one. We do a lot of that. But we should be able now

to do a lot of math, any subject, that's not one-on-one. I think it's important. I think it would be much easier for you and I if we didn't have so many things one-on-one. It would have been a little easier for me.

H. Tell me about the relationships with the people that you work with. Say we have already touched a little bit on your superintendent. Touch on your secretary. What's your relationship with your secretaries?

L. My secretary--my secretaries at school here?

H. Yes.

L. My feelings about secretaries is--I have a feeling about secretaries and their importance. I really feel secretaries are really one of the most people you need in your school. If your school works well, it is basically because your secretary helps you work it well. And I really think they are probably one of the most unsung heroes in the schools. Cause they know what's going on. They know more about kids. They know more about staff. They know more about custodians. They know more about almost anything in the school than we give them credit for. If we--and sometimes I just go in and close the door and sit and talk to my secretary because she can tell me things that I kind of like didn't even know that happened, or I didn't know that person that well. She'll tell me something about a teacher sometimes that I didn't even know. I mean, good things, I didn't even know those kind of things. They have their ears. They're like the ears to the world of the school. Really they are. And so I feel they're important and I try to take good care of them. I really try to take good care of my secretaries.

H. How about your custodial staff?

L. Oh, I take good care of them, too. I take good care of the secretaries and the custodial staff cause it is a group of people that if you want something and if you want your school to run, you better be good to your custodial staff. Because they don't see themselves as being important to the school, and they see themselves in a menial task. So you have to treat them good. I try my best to treat the

custodians good because they help run the school, and they, too, know more things that are going on around the school and the school system than I ever know. I know that.

H. What if I asked the teachers about you? What do you think they would say about you?

L. Depends on who you ask!

H. Doesn't it though!

L. I have some teachers who would tell you, "I think she's fair." I think other teachers would tell you, "I think she's knowledgeable." I have other teachers who would tell you, "I think you can go to her for anything and she'll either tell you up front 'Yes' or 'No, I'm going to do it for you.'" And, "She would try to help you through anything that she'll come into your classroom and help you whenever you need to if you want it." There are other teachers that will tell you, "I don't like her because I don't think that she's fair" and that's because it's been a one-on-one kind of situation. You know that I've done something or said something that they've disagreed with. And I've seen them do some things to kids that I don't like, and I don't think is fair to them [the students], and I've said that.

H. Do you think it's mostly just a one-on-one thing?

L. I think it's one-on-one. I think each one of them would tell you it's one-on-one.

H. So did you really--you really didn't choose this career path? It was just more or less--or you did choose this career path?

L. No. I really did not. Not that way. When I went into teaching and that was not my first choice, and that's why I say to you all the time that when I say that kids change their minds we should do something, because I did that. I changed my mind probably because originally I think when I started college I was going to--right out of high school--when I was in high school I was in at that point you had business courses and you had college prep and what-not, and I was in business classes. So I took all business courses. That was my thing. I thought

at that time I was going to go into business. I wanted to go into accounting. Accounting, at the time when I came along, was not a woman's thing. It was absolutely taboo. And I can remember when I wanted to go to the institute in [Largecity], and I lived in [Largecity] at the time and I enrolled. And they just simply said, "We don't take females." So that was the time. And there was nothing you could do about it, not a thing you could do about it because there was no such thing as equal rights and all that kind of thing. So it was the thing. So I went to night school for business, and I decided the second year I was there--I decided I didn't want to do it anymore. So I just quit. And then my family moved to [southern state], and I decided I wanted to go there. I went to college. I didn't know what I wanted to do. I had no idea what I wanted to do. I just went to college. And the second year I was in college, I decided I wanted to be a nurse. So I took all these science courses, all these math courses, and I thought that was what I wanted to be. I really thought that was what I wanted to do. So I went to college and I went back and finished the second year. And I enrolled in [southern college] in [Largecity]. I stayed one week and went home. I packed up my clothes and went home. I was there one week. I went home. I didn't like it. I hated it. I hated every minute of it so I went home. And my brother at that time lived in [southern state] and that's where I called home so I went back to [Largecity]. And I decided I'd go back to school there. I went back to [southern college]. And I didn't know what I wanted to do. I had no idea what I wanted to do. I met the supervisor--which was a lady--of elementary education and just talking with her one day she said, "Why don't you give elementary education a try?" And I said, "OK." I walked in, and I loved it from day one. From the very first day I went into it, I loved it, and that was it. So I was kind of hooked on that. So I worked in [small town] for two years and then I came to Ohio, and I worked here, and I knew I wanted to go back and get my Masters but I really didn't know what. I had no idea what my Masters was. I just have no idea where my life was going. You can just tell that. I don't. I have no plan. I didn't have this laid-out pattern like most people have in their lives, but I decided I wanted to go back and I went to [small liberal arts college], and I picked up and someone said to me, "Why don't you do counseling?" and I said, "That sounds good." So I picked up a counseling degree, and I enjoyed it. That was it. But it was some place along the line between 1972 and 1975 that I just watched what was happening with administrators,

mostly men. I just watched what they were doing with kids, and how kids were getting into trouble constantly, and the kind of attitude they had towards kids. And I just thought, "I can do this as well as they can or better because I think I have more interest, more of the kids' interest in heart rather than just pulling out a book and simply saying this is what you did and this is the suspension you get for that." No regards for how the kid felt. No real trying to work with the parent. Trying to work with the kid. None of that. It was just a matter of like a slap. You did it. This is what you got. Goodbye. You know, and angry parents, angry kids going in and out of the office constantly. And that was what made me decide I wanted to go into administration. I really kind of felt it did not have to be such a--I don't know--such an ugly way to deal with people. There was no caring about them. You know, being an administrator, and I'm sure that everybody can't do that, but being an administrator sometimes you can be caring at the same time. You can tell a kid almost anything as long as they think you care about them, and if you show them that you care about them. I can suspend a kid tomorrow, and as long as he or she thinks I care about them, I can bring them back in the next day and talk with them, and they can go about their business. But I just thought the business was just so cold, and that was my reason for getting into it.

H. Do you have one brother?

L. I have one brother.

H. That's all?

L. Living. I had one brother who passed away. I have one brother who's living.

H. Two brothers. Older?

L. Yes. I'm the youngest.

H. Yeah. I was the youngest with two brothers, too. How did your family work. Was there a pecking order there with your brothers?

L. We came from what you would call a dysfunctional family in terms of--and that was not our fault cause our father passed away before I was born. He passed away like two months before I was born. So my mom just kind of like raised us on her own. And my mom left [southern state] when I was like two years old to go to [northern city] to live because she felt she could make more money there. And that's how I lived with my grandmother so, you know in terms of family, my brothers and I were close because there was just the three of us, and we had to depend on each other. We were extremely close. My youngest brother and I were even closer. The older brother was older, and he was gone, but the youngest one---and he was eight years older than I am so he's not really that younger--but he and I were just like--it was he who kind of like nourished and raised and anybody whom I had to depend on it had to be my brother. And he and I were extremely close. Even today we're extremely close. We don't live near each other, but we're extremely close.

H. Well, let's see. What else do I need to ask you? What's your day like?

L. My day?

H. Tell me about a couple of the things you do and how it goes.

L. My day begins something like about five-fifteen in the morning cause I take calls for people for absentees. So I wake up at five fifteen whether I get a call or not.

H. For teachers?

L. For teachers. So that's how it begins at like five-fifteen. I leave for work as close to seven o'clock as I possibly can. Sometimes later, but mostly seven o'clock. When I come in for the day, a typical day begins with absent teachers. Who was absent. And I usually oversee those people who'll be substitutes coming in. I don't write them up cause I have a person here who does that. But I try to oversee who's coming in just to see where they are and who's classes they're covering that day to make sure they are in the best place. Sometimes when the person who calls--I won't always put them in the right place. So, if at all possible, if I have to do any shifting, I try to make

sure they are in the best place for them and in the best place for the kids they are going to serve that day. After that, it could be a conference, depending on parents, if they're here. If not, I do a lot of walking through the building. I do a lot of just popping in classes. I don't necessarily have an agenda in terms of that. I'm in the halls when the bell rings almost every period. Unless I get caught in the office with someone or I'm on the phone or something like that, but I'm usually in the hallway when it does that. I go to the cafeteria, not on cafeteria duty, but I make a trip to the cafeteria as much as possible during the three lunch periods. Sometimes outside in the parking lot. I make those rounds. I just make a lot of rounds in the building so a lot of times I'm just moving around about the building. If I have to do some observations, I do that during that period of time. Whenever, but that's usually scheduled pretty much. But a typical day is just a day when you have to put on your track shoes and be in and around this building most of the time. So the kids see you. The kids know that. They know when I'm here. They know when I'm gone. They definitely know when I'm gone. Word gets around real fast when I'm not here. They tell each other, " She's not here today."

H. They ask my secretary--"Where is she?" Like she's going to tell them. Who do you hang around with?

L. Where? At school?

H. Say you go to a football game.

L. The assistant principals sometimes. The assistant principal-- anybody. I hang around with anybody. It doesn't really make any difference. I'm not a--I guess I'm not an administrator all the time in terms of having to be with administrators all the time. I'm not that kind of person. I can--I'll go to the game with the cheerleader sponsor. I'll go to the game with anybody. Really, I don't really care. Sometimes I'll go by myself. And I don't want to talk to anybody. I just want to go by myself. And sometimes I'll go with a kid. If the kids want to come sit with me, if I'm sitting at a game and they want to sit, fine, I don't really care. I really don't. It doesn't matter to me.

H. Is this what you wear to school for the most part? Jacket? Pants?

L. I wear jackets, pants, skirts.

H. You wear skirts?

L. Yeah. A lot of skirts.

H. Ever think about why you wear what you wear?

L. No. Cause I'm comfortable in it.

H. Oh. So you do think about what you wear--why you wear what you wear.

L. I guess so. I'm comfortable. I wear things that are comfortable--what I consider are comfortable. I won't wear anything that I consider uncomfortable just for--you know, I won't wear it for somebody else. I won't wear it because you tell me I think you ought to wear that. I'm not comfortable, and I won't wear it. I won't do that any other time either, not just work. I wear the same thing I wear to work, you know, if I'm going out some place. You know I have certain things I won't wear out other places. But as a rule, I have clothes I wear to school and I wear them someplace else, you know. If I am going out for an evening out, I may dress up a little bit more, but I wear the same things. I wear the same skirt. I may change the top--make the top differently, something like that. But I wear a lot of jackets, a lot of blouses and jackets and slacks or skirts. I don't wear heels too much anymore. I used to, but the age has gotten to the point where you don't wear too many of those anymore. You want to move pretty fast, you know. And truly the job does dictate that, though. It really does. I mean if you want to--and you got high school kids and you want to keep up with them, you really. It does. It kind of dictates--you just don't. You want to keep up. And you are on your feet a lot. You don't wear those kind of things anymore.

H. You see my nice, flat shoes, too. Well, what else do you want to tell me that would give me a perception of you in this job? Anything else?

L. Well, if I had to do it again, I'd do it. I'd tell you that. I've never regretted it. I've had friends of mine. Other people who've said they hated what they've done. I have almost thirty years in the business, and I've not hated one year of it. No matter what it was. From the very beginning I've enjoyed every year I've done. Every year has been different. I, you know, if I did anything any differently, I might have gone into administration a little earlier and not--well, I may have gone in as a principal, as a principalship of a job earlier--if I look back on anything I would have done differently-- rather than stay as an assistant principal as long as I have. But there was circumstances under which I didn't do that either cause at that time I had a family. I was married. The whole bit. So you don't just move and go. If you were single or something like that, then I would probably would have gone into it because I would have had to move. I wouldn't have been able to do it in [Anytown], because [Anytown] was not ready for that at that particular time. I knew that. That was my one reason for not trying to get a position as a principal, because [Anytown] was just not ready for a woman at that time.

H. Why do you think that?

L. Well, I think that this is the very nature of the conservative side of [Anytown] itself. It just wasn't ready. You had to prove yourself. I think I had to do that. And I think being an assistant principal allowed me the opportunity to prove that I could handle the position as a principal. And I think it kind of helped, and I don't mean it, I think it helped other school districts in and around [Anytown], too, to realize that if a female can handle the job in [Anytown], then other school districts begin to look at it and say, "By George, we should be able to do that same thing." Because up until then, there was no females in these positions at all around this area.

H. Why do you think that? It's like you're lesser. Why do you suppose it's perceived that way? Have you given it any thought?

L. What? Lesser as a female? See I never looked at that way, Beth , because I never went for something I didn't want. So I guess so, I never....

H. But why do you think they would think--Can a woman do that? What is it about?

L. I think that was just the very nature of people. And I think that was something that--(Shrugs)

H. How do you think schools would be different had women been administrators all along?

L. I think it would have progressed a little faster. I believe that. I think that women are a little bit more progressive than men. I think we take a little bit more chances than we think. I think that men will get into a status quo kind of position. They find one that works well and we stay there. We work with it and we don't take a chance. I don't think men take a chance at wanting to change anything.

H. I wonder why that is, cause I kind of agree with that--just gut-level.

L. Cause I think they just like things to be as they are. They just aren't going to take a chance at upsetting something and see if it will run differently--a different way. They just like them, you know, men just like to see things run well. It can run the same way for thirty, forty years. It is all right with them. It is the same thing with wearing the same shirt and tie for ten, twenty years. They do that. Wear the same shirt and tie. They don't change. You know, you wouldn't dare do that. Neither would I. You wouldn't think about wearing the same and you know, it is a dumb analogy, but it is. You wouldn't think about wearing the same dress that you wore ten, even five years ago. Guys will wear the same suits they've worn for the last ten years. You know and that's just the way I think it's different. Like I said, I think it's a lot of Boards of Education and a whole lot of people and superintendents who never, you know, because those are men. For women to come in and say, "I can do that job," you would have to prove yourself. It's unfortunate we have to work so hard to prove ourselves. You do have to work much harder to do that. It's unfortunate but we do.

H. Let me ask you just one more quick thing--then I have to flip my tape. The giving up of power--How do you see power fitting into this?

Do you see that as fitting into that somehow? Because I've been thinking about that.

L. It's a power struggle. It's a power for--let me put it this way--I'm not too sure, I guess the best way I can say that is--When I first got this job when I told you the story about the first time I got this job there was three men here at [Anyschool]. Three men who had been married probably twenty years or something like that.

H. Now this is when you were going to be the A.P.?

L. Yeah.

H. O.K.

L. And to them it was as if I had infringed upon something that, I had stepped over a line that this is as far as you are supposed to go, and if you do that, you're right, that you are going to that what kind of powers are you going to take away from them. It was almost, I could see it happening, I don't know how to explain it to you, but I could see from a counseling point-of-view, I could see the struggle that went on in the minds of men to outdo me. I could see the guys working around here to make sure that they got recognition for everything that they did. And which was crazy, because I wasn't out to out do anybody. I was just doing a job and that is the crazy part about it is--I didn't see that, I didn't need that, but they did, and it was. It was even a power struggle. It was almost like when the first principal who was here, whom I worked with retired, the first question that was asked was, "Are you going up for the principal's job?" And at that point the answer was "No", because I really had no idea, I had no thought of doing it anyway. So the answer was "No". I didn't want it. I didn't have any desire to do it, and it was almost like a sigh of relief, "Well, of course, she isn't going to go after it." And even when I applied for this job in 1989, when the job became available, there was people who were out asking or saying, "Well, if she is going to apply for it, I'm not going to." You know it was almost like, they gave up at that point, they had given up. I don't know why. I can't understand why. You know I don't think that I was much better than anybody else. I don't think I had done anything that much better than anybody else, but I do think that men, that a lot of the men whom I

worked with really felt for a long time that it was a power struggle. I think men do got gall in general. It's just like a marriage. Who's got to be the boss? I mean they got to be the boss, if they're not the bosses then, if they can't show where I'm the guy who thinks quicker than you, or get through better than you, or something like that. I don't understand that kind of thinking. I just don't understand it. I guess that is the crazy part about it.

H. How do the male teachers differ? How are the female teachers?

L. Great.

H. No problems?

L. They've gotten accustomed to it. The first year I was here it was a bit difficult. Some of the male teachers I had, I was lucky though cause I teachers in the men I had to supervise that year was social studies. And those I guys, I think, have a different feel for what it's like. But there was other men who really-- but luckily for me I had known, I had knew a lot of people in [Anytown] because I had been in [Anytown] so long by the time I came to the high school you kind of knew your reputation precedes you, and I had been a counselor at [the high school on the other side of town], and then I moved here a lot of those teachers remembered me from there. When we did the consolidation a lot of them moved in, and they remembered me from there. And I really don't think I have changed that much as a person, I think basically as a person I am the same, and I treat people the same. I don't hold grudges. I don't care about them--about grudges in terms of what you have done before, so be it.

H. Did you do power sharing things, do you think? Did you do a lot of them?

L. I try to. I think so.

H. Committees?

L. I do a lot of that. I do a lot of it, because if you want to say, I'm lazy.

H. It's harder to do that!

L. It's lazy in terms of--now when I say that that's not really fair. It's a assessment of it either. Um, I like to give, I like for other people to own part of what is going on. I think it's, I like it for it's healthy for me. It's healthy. Some people can't do that, but for me it's really healthy, and I don't mind it. So, therefore, I do give, I try and give a lot of power sharing kinds of things to other people and let them get some. I don't mind them getting the glory for, I really don't. And I guess part of that is because I've done, you know I've, Beth, it doesn't matter. You know you've got thirty years and what does it, and how much..

H. It doesn't matter at this point.

L. How much am I going to, you know what is it going to do? It's time for somebody else to get in. What am I going to do with it?

H. What's anybody going to do with anything?

L. That's right. But what are they going to do with anybody? What am I going to do with it, but in essence, that's the way I look at it. What are they going to do with it, too? But if it makes them feel good, let them have it. Because really it isn't going to get me any place at this point. It doesn't usually get them too much further either. Not really.

H. No, no, no. It's all in here wading around together.

L. That's it! That's it. That's exactly what it is. Were all here and we'll just continue to do this.

H. We all have our little part of it to play.

L. We only get out so far and then after a while you get pulled right back into the mix anyway. The only time you get away from this is when you retire.

H. Which we're all looking forward to. I think we're done.

APPENDIX B

Fay

H: First of all I need some demographic stuff on you. Tell me about yourself personally. Obviously, you're white....

F: Yes, married --

H: How long?

F: 24 years.

H: Wow! Children and all that?

F: One boy, nearly seventeen, who goes to school here, by the way, he's a junior in this building, yeah, good news and bad. He's not a perfect child, so that's not necessarily bad news when your mother's the one that goes "You're right to an attorney...." What else can I tell you?--40--How old am I? 47--I will be 47 next Sunday.

H: Next Sunday? My birthday's Saturday. Well, that's the important thing; we're shutting this off. And you're going to take the day off - you're not going to do anything for school, right, on Sunday.

F: Yes, I am. Sunday I'm doing nothing for school.

H: Me, too. Saturday is like a shut-down day.

F: Shut-down day. Going to do nothing.

H: Well, good.

F: I've been in education, been a teacher starting in [particular] County; was a math teacher for many, many years and numerous principals said "You need to be in administration." I was going, "I don't want the headache, I don't want to be." Needed some course work to renew certificates--starting that routine--and I said, "Well, I'm going to take coursework toward something. I'm not going to

just take basket weaving.” Ended up, I said, “Well, let’s pursue this administrative thing.” Sat for a couple of years getting interviews, but no jobs. The typical kind of thing. Well, can a woman handle a high school kid? Being the typical smartmouth, I said, “When was the last time you asked your principal to beat up a kid?” Just turned the interview person off right away, because you’re sitting there going, “What the hell kind of question is this? Maybe I don’t want to work for this guy anyhow.” And I got an opportunity from a superintendent that had hired me years ago as a teacher in southern Ohio down by [particular town] who said “I need an assistant principal.” I said, “On my way.” Packed baggage, husband, and child and moved down to [southern town], Ohio. Fortunately, they were O.K., and my husband said, “Where are we going to live?” And I said, “It’s O.K., Honey, real pretty. Lots of golf courses. You’ll like it.” And he’s a salesperson, so he is able to relocate. That opportunity led to an assistant principal’s position in [northern town]. I really didn’t want to leave where I was with the superintendent cause he was a really neat guy and very supportive and all that kind of stuff, but to go from a small school 7-12 to a big city school was what I needed, obviously, as a resume builder. The [northern town] position came about, and I was delighted to go there. From [northern town], this position as high school principal opened where I was a teacher for ten years. And several board members here called me and said, “We’re going to have an opening--we liked you when you were a teacher. Would you consider coming back?” “Yes, I would.” Came and interviewed--superintendent--three years ago. Here I am.

H: How about the Board?

F: Good news and bad, since then, the board has changed and I am probably going to be fired tomorrow. So, I sit here saying to you, “I may not be a high school principal.” It’s a personality thing. I am not a person who sits back and goes, “If you cut industrial arts from my building, you will harm children.” I’m not going to sit here and take that quietly, and that does not tend to make people fond of you when you do those kinds of things. However, I am a kid advocate--will always be--and here I sit, looking for another position. But, there are several going to open in this area, and I have great confidence that one board member in a neighboring community has already contacted me and said, “I think I need a principal. You are the person I want.

Keep me in mind kind of thing.” So I have great confidence that there will be bigger schools come about in that area.

H: Live by the seat of your pants.

F: Yeah, yeah, you know how that goes. The official didn’t show up. What am I going to do? Striped shirt and a whistle.

H: O.K. Well, let’s see. Why did you choose this particular career path?

F: It kind of fell into place, and it was one of those I wanted. I always worked well with kids. I was always good at motivating kids--always good at all those kind of things. My peers would approach me for advice. I said “Well, gosh, why shouldn’t I be the person in the head honcho chair?” And that’s kind of how it came about. Now once I’m here, I’m going. I don’t know if I want this or not. Let me think about that.

H: But, you don’t have time to think about it.

F: That’s absolutely correct.

H: You’ve already told me about getting your first administrative job. Tell me a story about the intersection of gender and your job. You already started to tell me one and I said, “Stop, stop. Let me put the tape in.”

F: As I said to you, one of the things that I hear--a woman who is decisive, who is intellectual, who is motivated, who is Type A task--who can, by the way, put her arm around a kid and say it’s O.K.--we’re going to deal with this--is a bitch. A man is deemed a good leader because he is all of those kinds of things. And that’s part of the society thing here. Why? And obviously, there are studies. There are minimal, if any, derogatory terms for a sexually active man. For a woman there’s got to be over two hundred of them. How come? These are gender types of issues. The League meetings are

interesting meetings. Have you interviewed [female principal at another high school]?

H: No

F: [Particular] High School. [Name] is also high school principal in [nearby district]. [Name] joined us this year. League meetings, the typical job environment is less than--most of the gentlemen are really cool. They know me. We talk. It's cool. They give credibility to my input. There are those who will absolutely not even talk to me. This year, I happen to be president of the League, which is a rotating thing, certainly not anything elected, because you don't even want to run for this office. There are guys who will not deal well with that. They won't deal well with that; just blow off your ideas and decisions. And that's O.K. because I sit right beside them at the next meeting and, "Here I am, John, and yes, you're going to have to listen to me, and yes, my ideas have credibility and if you don't like it, that's your problem. You're going to have to deal with it."

H: I get to be the president of our league next year. I'm secretary this year, that's bad enough. It's like a rotating thing.

F: It is.

H: You feel badly not taking your turn.

F: We have a really great commissioner, though, and [name] does a whole lot of most of the stuff. I'm almost like a figurehead kind of thing. And that's O.K. That's all I want. I don't have to do a lot of decisions. Extra meetings to go to kind of stuff, but the commissioner does a lot of stuff that I'm sure in some leagues the president gets to do.

H: And what league is this?- [Particular league]?

F: [Particular name], right.

H: Of course, I know this stuff.

F: See. We just picked up [four other schools].

H: I was in [neighboring district] for a long time. How about dealing with students in disciplinary situations and things like that? How do you deal with those? What do the kids say about you? Give me a feel for that.

F: Depends on who you talk to. 98% of the students in this building say that it's a very strict building, but that it's fair. That if you are a senior who gets in trouble all the time, you have the same consequence as a sophomore girl, you know, it's a boy/girl kind of thing. They are very, very appreciative of the books as $x=y$ and $x=y$. Now, you and I also know, I hope, I believe, that there are occasionally extenuating circumstances, and those kinds of issues never become public, in that I may not give Saturday school to this particular student, but that's because of extenuating circumstances. The student and I will work out something. Meaning--the kid's been abused, the father just died, the mother's--those kind of major things, not I ripped my pants kind of stuff. The 2% who would say to you, "It's terrible and horrible here," obviously, are perfect children. You know, those who want no consequence to their behavior. They will say to you, "It's terrible and it's mean, and she's an awful human being." I am a hug person. I need to touch. I'm one of those people, for whatever our sensory kinds of things are, you will frequently see me hug a kid. I always shake hands with a kid before they leave my office. It's a thing of saying, "You did this. This is the consequence. I'll sign your pass. We shake hands. Thank you very much." And we move on. I need them to understand that consequence doesn't mean you're a bad person. It means you made a dumb decision. I think that's where a woman, and, here we go, it's a gender kind of thing, it's O.K. for me to be compassionate. It's O.K., and this is the bad part for the man kind of thing, men who are compassionate, who are caring, who--[Pauses] I can hug kids far easier than a man without fear of reprisal. Pure and simple, and I do. I'm always hugging kids. That's just the way I am, and the kids are cool about it. They understand it and they just, "O.K., fine." And they understand just because you're suspended doesn't mean you're a bad person, doesn't mean, I don't like you, doesn't mean we're not going to be getting along fine. Doesn't mean that a week from now, I'm going to throw it up in your face. It means, we dealt with it today, and this is the consequence, and now we're going to move on. And like I said, there

are always those 2% of parents who--they talk to me through the secretary-- they'll call and go, "Is SHE here?!" The secretary will say, "Yes." "WELL, GIVE HER THIS MESSAGE" "O.K., fine." And the secretary laughs and says, "So and so is on the phone and said to tell you-- " and we do this intercom kind of thing. That's O.K., because I'm proud that those parents are not pleased with me because that means that their kid's getting really ticked-off at these behaviors and hopefully something will change. Or they'll take them to another school. O.K. with me.

H: Champion.

F: Yeah, really.

H: How about the leadership structure of this? You don't have an assistant? You have a superintendent?

F: Correct.

H: In working with your teachers, how does that structure work for you in terms of working with your superintendent? Working with your teachers?

F: I'm very a TQM kind of person. Superintendent happens to be a very supportive kind of person. We are two very diverse personalities. He is a non-confrontational, very--if I can scoot around an issue and not face it, then I'll do that. I, on the other hand, am a smack it in the face kind of person, and get the task done and move on kind of person. We complement each other. He has been supportive. He will ask me to do things, and I will certainly do them, because, that's what I'm supposed to do. I will, however, maybe give my opinion of what I feel about the task. That's me. That's what I want. I can't be two-faced, and I can't lie because I forget who I lied to. Too stupid. The building is run very-very similar, very-very strong faculty advisor committee. We meet on a regular basis. What issues come up, these are issues we need to talk about. The faculty advisory committee is right now working on a crisis plan. What happens if the drug dogs are coming in? What happens if somebody gets shot? What happens if--? And the staff feels very comfortable. And so do the students and the parents. Come in. Talk to me about it. Yell and

scream at me. That's O.K. . We'll deal with it. We'll move on. We'll get it over with. Staff, I believe, are very comfortable. And again, gee, go figure, there are a couple of staff members who would like to see me move on, because I am there saying, excuse me, your class starts at 8:32. Your butt's supposed to be in your class room. It's a little minor thing on my part, I'd like you to be there. No, it's not O.K. to miss 20 days of school in the first semester. And they have not necessarily in the past had guys who did that. But, the rest of the staff are very pleased. You know, so and so has been due for years, and now they're getting their just dues. And you and I know that just means that their file is getting fatter, but, at least, I feel better that the file is getting fatter. Something is being done.

H: What's your relationship with your secretary? We haven't touched on that at all.

F: Incredible. I have two secretaries. A confidential secretary who handles the finances in the student activity fund and my personal correspondences. And I have a lady, who greeted you at the door, who is the attendance officer. Greeting secretary does the EMIS kind of stuff. Both of them are absolutely incredible. From the beginning, it was not. I had known Mrs. [Name] from being a teacher here, I have to tell you; and she has mentioned to me since--now we've been together three years-- that in the beginning it was, "Boy, people always told me working for a woman was going to be hard." Well, you know, excuse me, the thing that I do--yeah, they work hard. They do their stuff and they really break their back. But, I also make sure that I tell them, "God, I'm glad you were here today. Thanks for doing what you were doing this morning. You handled such and such a situation very well. Here is a carnation for the morning. Have a donut once in a while, a muffin. Hey, it's twenty minutes early today, get out of here. It's a Friday afternoon. Get out. You had a long, hard week." They understand that there's a balance between thanking you very much for being here and doing your job, and I am appreciative of what you do. Like anybody else, if you tell them thank you very much for doing what you're doing, they like hearing thank you and they'll work a little harder. It's a unique kind of circle, and I don't do it because I want to see them work harder. [Name], that is new this year, last secretary that I had, had a baby and decided not to come back to work. We were very fortunate to get [name]. [Name] has fit

in very well. We laugh. We giggle. We have a great time, but we work very hard. And they are not people who say, "Ha, it's 3:00 and I'm outta here." They will get done what you need to get done. And they know I'll work it out with them, whatever is necessary. So, the relationship could not be any better. Absolutely my two biggest supporters are the two secretaries. Absolutely.

H: How about the custodians?

F: Again, good news and bad. The custodians in the building are not necessarily the most efficient people---I say with a smile. And I tend to mention that to them on occasion that, "Guys keep the front of the building clean, O.K.? Tend to look at the top of the showcase when it's filled with sandwiches and cans. Yeah, you're right, the kids shouldn't be putting them there. Not my issue. I will try to catch those horrible people that put the can on top of the showcase. If I don't, in the meantime, please, take it down. Take the can down and wipe it and clean it. Nothing is worse on an impression when somebody walks in this building and they see stairs that are ripped to pieces or they see dirt everywhere. Not O.K." We have a head custodian, he works very well. He would do anything in the world for me. And again it's, "John, you know could you help me with such and so?" "Yep, I can do that," he says. One particular custodian doesn't do his job real well and he tends to be negative towards my kids. He will frequently make remarks, you know, "Well, those loser kids are gonna play basketball again tonight. Are you gonna be there?" That's not O.K. with me, and I tend to tell him that. I say "[Name], I'm gonna tell you, if you can't say something good about the kids, don't say anything around me. It's not O.K." That does not endear him to me. Oh, well, these are the people who are paying your pay check, you dirtball, go home. If you're gonna complain, go home to complain. Don't come into this building and get a paycheck and do nothing and complain about it and expect me to ignore it. Not gonna happen. But, generally, I get along well with everybody. Laugh, and tend to do fine. And I tend to say, "Thanks so much for helping me," and they do, and that makes it very good, too. Cafeteria ladies are the same way. They love me. They just--you know it's that "Pst! We've got some broken cookies over here. Like to have one of these broken cookies?" They know I love their fresh baked cookies. And they've been known to break a couple in half so they can go, "You know, we've got a couple of broken

cookies in the corner here. Would you like to have it?" We work very well together. And I'm a very approachable person. I am not a stand off, staunch individual, stiff collared type of person. I'm just me and I'm talking to everybody and they like that. And I'm giving them credibility. When they need my support because some kid is giving them [grief], I'm not afraid to kick butt and take names. And they are appreciative of the fact that they have the same credibility as a teacher who is having a problem with a kid. Not O.K. to be disrespectful to the cafeteria lady anymore than it is to the classroom teacher. And they are appreciative of that. They are recognized as individuals. So we work very well together. Bus drivers, too. Bless their little hearts. They send in an office referral form because the kid's been bad and they just smile and they go, "I can't wait till you see [Name]. It's going to be so thrilling." And they just know they are going to be supported in their task. So, they're very pleased.

H: Let's talk about stiff collars and things like that. What do you usually wear when you come to school? Have you ever thought "Why?"

F: I try to dress very well. I believe that the appearance lends some credibility to the individual. If there is a parent coming in here, and you will notice behind me are all of my diplomas and all of my certificates, and all of my plaques, and everything else. When the person sits here and looks at [Fay Johnson], I want them to see behind me-- hey, I've done my dues here. I know a little about what I speak. I don't want to be sitting here in sweatshirts and jeans. I want them to say, "This is a professional that commands respect physically as well as educationally." I'm a firm believer in that kind of issue. Some people are not. Some people are very modest in their we don't want to tell anyone what kind of workshops and courses we've been to. I think it lends credibility to me. So, I tend to dress in suits, in good dresses, in--and they harass me--always have high heels on. I do not wear, unless I'm wearing slacks, and once in a while I wear a slack suit, and I wear flats or something of the sort, and that's fine. And days that I'm going to be running like a banshee throughout the building because I know things are going on, I'll wear flats, but, I believe I must dress the part of the professional leader of this building, so I tend to do that. Once in a while, we have a jeans

day on Friday and I'll manage to throw on a pair of jeans, and the kids'll go, "You have jeans? All right!" And I go, "Yeah, yeah."

H: They think you don't have sweats, jeans. How about your day. What is your day like?

F: I'm in the building by 7:05. The school day starts at 7:42. Between 7:05 and 7:42, parents will call. This has happened. They call to report sick, and the secretary takes the call. But the parents also know that if there's a problem they can call me during those times. I'm always here. At 7:30, I tend to go out and roam around the halls a little bit because there are not staff everywhere they need to be. And that's an irregular kind of thing. I go one direction to the cafeteria, another direction to the shop, just so the kids are out and seeing me around. 7:42, I do the announcements and I do that because I just like doing that. I like starting the day off. I do tend to start the day off with a joke. And they're dumb and they're stupid jokes, but the kids laugh at them and they understand that it's O.K. to laugh at school. It's O.K. to smile and like being here. From the end of the announcements, I then try to get in the first thing in the morning the discipline referrals that came in, but I didn't get done, from the day before. And depending on the situation, if it's somebody's going to get detentions or Saturday schools, I'll deal with them the first thing in the morning. Suspensions, I always wait till the end of the day. Let's not make everybody's day miserable by starting with a fight first thing in the morning. After that the day is spent putting out fire. I'm in classrooms. I'm walking the halls. The superintendent calls. Things that need to be done. I deem it putting out fires. I'm running from one place to another. I try to be in the halls between classes and in classes. I just bop in--and that was hard. Hard to get staff members to not stop teaching when I come into the room. They were so acclimated to--principal's here. She probably wants something. Probably need something. No, I'm just bopping in. I want to see the frog that your cutting apart today. I want to listen to you speak the Spanish today. I want the kids to see me. I want to be approachable. I want them to know that I'm just--I'm just here. I'm always around. I want them to think there's six of me running around this building, because I also think that helps control situations in the building. I'm at 2:31--the bell rings--I'm in the cafeteria from 10:49 to 12:10. That's the junior high-high school lunch. I have staff

members on duty, however, if it falls within that range of possibility, I try to be in the cafeteria. I try to walk around. Talk to kids. Go, 'Hey, good wrestling match last night. I was very proud of your behavior at the basketball game. Those kinds of things. Just interacting with the kids, and the cafeteria ladies who are feeding me cookies along the way. 2:31, I'm always in the front lobby. The children are leaving. "Good-bye, boys and girls. Hey, Jason you forgot your book. Ricky, don't you have a detention this afternoon?" I have a size of school that I can do a lot of those things. Wave to the little bus drivers--I have my little queen wave--and they laugh and the bus drivers as they go by the lobby, do the queen wave to Mrs. [Johnson], and it's great, and they're out. After the buses have left, I have my intervention assistance team meets two days a week at 2:30, and I tend to make phone calls then. The phone calls that I didn't get to during the day, that have accumulated. I try to get done between 3:00 and 4:30. Get things organized, and, oh, by the way, then you get those tasks done after 2:30-3:00, especially after the secretaries leave. Those are gone, and the kids are gone, and I can sit here and do those tasks that need to be done that didn't get done during the day, because you're busy dealing with discipline. You're busy dealing with the kid that got thrown out of school. You're busy dealing with all these kinds of issues. So I call it putting out fires all day. The definites are the announcements, the cafeteria, and the buses.

H: O.K., If you could direct school renewal all by your little self, nobody to tell you "no", no limits on money, best of all worlds--we've just been dropped into Shangri-La. What would you do?

F: Are you talking Ohio schools, or are you talking [this] School?

H: Umm--Yes.

F: Just throw a topic at me, here, and I'll just say, "Fuck, I don't think we ought to renew schools. Just drop them all."

H: Let's completely redo the whole system.

F: Let's start with, first thing I would do, I would do away with mandatory education. I think there's a point where the hassles with

a fourteen-year-old who is absolutely not going to be in school, who is going to be nothing but a headache, go home. Then, when you're fifteen-and-a-half and you can't get a job, then come in. Now come back at fifteen-and-a-half, and now say to me, "You know, I'd really like to do history again." Great! Now we can give you some. If you fight this kid till he's sixteen, and then he's got to go out and find a job, O.K., he's got a job washing dishes. By the time he realizes he wants to come back, he's eighteen and we deal the kid the GED. O.K., fine. That would be my first issue. And the second thing is, I would find a way to fund so that every student--during one of my Master's programs in finance, I had come up with this program, to equally divide industrial property taxes. The Perry Nuclear Power Plant is going to be spread out throughout the state. Perry Schools, bless their little hearts, are just a Taj Mahal. Unbelievable! They can't spend the money. They cannot spend the money. The athletic director, his comment was he got a notice that he was \$40,000 dollars over budget, but that they didn't care. Just next year try to keep it under. I'm going, "What! Are you crazy?" That's horrendous for that kind of thing to happen. I've seen it, and I'll use Youngstown Schools as an example, if those factories, the taxation is split throughout the state, then losing one of those steel mills affects everybody 3 cents, but it doesn't totally horrendously effect the Youngstown Schools. You're not going to have people in Perry happy about that, but you still need to keep your local property tax. That way if Shaker Heights wants to give a great big local property tax, and they want to support their schools better, fine, not a problem. School renewal--I think I'm just going to go helter skelter here. Willy nilly. I'm going to say proficiency tests are great. Glad to see that we have finally gotten kids that are made accountable. I think we were too much making kids not accountable. I think we need to be more careful on teacher training. I think we get people in the profession who don't have a clue. I think we talked about this just a little bit ago. Education funding has got to go somewhere in the state of Ohio. This school system in particular, we're managing to do O.K. We're managing to keep our head above water, but are we going to wind up consolidating with another school? I hope not. We do what's right for kids here because we're small, and because their principal can walk in the cafeteria and go, "Don't forget you detention tonight." Those are the things I think make better education for the kids. Did you have a specific thing in mind?

H: That's good. What is the purpose of school today, especially high school?

F: Keep kids off the street, my God, keep 'em right off that street cause they'd be out there, they'd be smokin' in the cafeteria if we didn't have it. The purpose of school is to prepare a student for adulthood. Teachers will tell you they don't teach values. Principals will tell you they don't want their teachers to teach values. I contend they do every time they say to a student, "It's not O.K. to not do your homework. You must be in class on time." Those are all issues that no matter what you're going to do, if you're going to be a brain surgeon or if you're going to haul trash, and I don't mean those to be opposite ends of the spectrum. Sometimes the pay is the same. I mean it to say, no matter what kind of training is necessary for your chosen vocation, you must have responsibilities. And I think schools, learning history is a great and wonderful kind of thing because it repeats itself, and the history teacher would just slap me if he ever heard I was saying history has less value than that, but who--unless you're at a party playing Trivial Pursuit--who's going to say to you, "What general surrendered at Appomatox?" I don't know. Who cares who surrendered there? We are preparing students for the real world by doing discipline, by teaching responsibility, by making them be in attendance, by all of those oh, by the way kinds of things, are good citizen kinds of things. And if you want to go be a math teacher or if you want to be a brain surgeon, we have to give you the academic background. We are affiliated here with [Particular] County Vocational School. Our students have great opportunities to be trained in any of a number of areas: cosmetology, food service, engine repairs. Whatever your chosen area is--we can get you trained. Some kind of basic training for you. Our purpose of education is to make good citizens. Period. And that would mean, of course in my opinion, that a good citizen is employed. A good citizen doesn't break the law. A good citizen pays their bills. A good citizen is responsible. Doesn't drink and drive. A good citizen--all of those kinds of things. And those are issues that we deal with at school.

H: Is there anything else you would like to tell me that would give me an understanding of you particular to this job that I didn't think to ask you? If my questions were poor....

F: This is one of those “and all others as assigned by.” I’ve read those fine prints before.

H: This is the catch all question.

F: Yeah, this is the one. I think I’m good at what I do. I’m good at what I do and I think that’s part of me also. I believe that an effective administrator, male or female, has got to have the ability to say, “I screwed up.” Correct it and move on. And the ability to say, “I believe strongly in such an issue that I will fight for that particular issue,” whatever it may be. Whether it may be baseball field dirt or whatever it happens to be, I will go out and do that. I think there aren’t enough women in the profession here because I think women haven’t come a long way, baby, in the education field. I’m sure, and I don’t know what the numbers are here, but I would be interested to know. What’s the percentage of female administrators in the elementary level?

H: Much higher.

F: Lots higher.

H: As someone who’s doing a lot of stats right now, much higher.

F: Yes, much, much higher. Because they believe that we want elementary principals to be nurturing, to be kind, to be loving, to be all of those things. Well, excuse me, why in the Dickens cannot a secondary principal have those same kinds of qualities and at the same time have the ability to kick butt when necessary? It’s a great job. There are days, as you well know, that I go home and go “What in God’s name am I doing this for?” I took a pay cut, if you will, on a per diem rate. I’d be making about \$40 a day [more], in this building, and not a third of the time, a third of the grief. Unbelievable! But, I like what to do what I do. I’m proud to do what I do.

H: If there were more women in this, what do you think would be different? Do you think anything would be different?

F: The lines at the principal's meetings would be longer. Honest to goodness, have you been to Columbus and got right in the bathroom? And the guys are standing outside, and they're going "Gotta wait in line to go to the bathroom and you're going, "Yes!" For once, the one time I have the ability here.

H: The same with League meeting.

F: It is! Nobody there. It's great. It's cool. I'm like, O.K., fine. What would be different? I don't know that I think, right off the top of my head, that anything would be different. Women have the same ideas. Women have the same, you know, we certainly have the same intellect. We have the same motivation for kids. I don't know that anything would be different. No, I don't believe that we're all of a sudden going to have flowers and cookies at all of the League meetings because the girls' in charge. I don't believe in those sexist kind of issues. But, I think that things would be the same. Maybe it would lend more credibility to those that are there. Maybe that's what would happen. I have not had trouble getting credibility. I am respected by my peers and, yes, there are a couple that will dig their heels in and say, "My God, there's not a broad that can do this job." And that's a cute story. I have to tell you this. My first--. This is a country community. A lot of blue collar people who make significantly less than I do. And the first year that I was here, in the fall, I was at a volleyball game, and a parent came up to me, and he got about 4 inches away from my nose, and he said, "You know, that's a hell of a lot of money for a broad." And I smiled and I said, "Well, that's pretty much what they pay the guy, so that's what they did." And we went on about our business. One year later, same guy, same situation, came up 4 inches from the nose and he went, "You're underpaid." I went, "All right!" He did not believe that a 'broad' could do the job and do it well, and do all of those kinds of issues. And, oh, by the way, make more than him--HA--I don't think so. And since then we have talked many times about that conversation. And he goes, "Yeah, yeah, you're right." And he's got a daughter who's a tremendous athlete, tremendous athlete, who will go on to college probably on an athletic scholarship. Volleyball and softball. Tremendous athlete. He works very hard with her. Would not want her to be treated less because she's a girl. But, women were not supposed to be the principal of the building. But, he is one example, and I love it because

I think, "Well, if Bob came this long direction, then somebody else can do it, too." I think there would be more credibility lent to the women here, if there were more of us. That would be the only change.

H: Do you think that any other of your demographics, like your brains or your age or any of those things impact in a more significant way than gender does? Do you think you're more ascribed by your gender or do you think you're more ascribed by something else?

F: Well, I have to tell you another little funny.

H: I love how you think of these stories, now that we're really going, cause I love the stories.

F: Basketball. Basketball game starting. Winter time. Group of fans always sits up underneath the sign at the top of the thing. [Whistles] I get one of these things. Game hasn't started yet, or it's halftime. I go trotting over and one of the guys says, "You know, you could turn the heat on in this just a little bit." And I said, "You don't understand. I think this gym feels real good so you're either going to have to find a guy principal or a younger woman if you want heat in the gym." And he went, "Oh, yeah?" I said, "It feels real fine to me. I'm having a little heat right now so don't even mess with me with the heat in the gym. O.K.?" and he went, "O.K." I think me is my personality. I think that I was raised as an independent person. My dad wanted a son and didn't get one until eight years later, and here I was-- independent. Worked hard for everything I've always had, expect students to work hard for everything they've got. Didn't get a college education except by working for myself. Came from a poor farm family, so to speak. I think I've had to work for everything and when students say to me, "I can't afford college." I just want to wring their throat and say, "Excuse me, you're looking here at a person, and yeah, college was cheaper when I went, but I also worked for fifty cents an hour. The proportion is the same. If you want an education, you can go and get it." I do not believe that gender--I don't think gender was considered when I was hired for this job. I think that the fact the previous board said, "This is a woman we know. Taught in the building. Did well. Worked well with kids. Worked well with the community. Was involved in all these activities. Has credibility in our mind." I don't think they thought of me as male or female. I don't

think they sat and said, "Should we put a woman in charge?" They were putting [Fay] in charge, and that to them was not a gender issue. And there are areas that I go that, "There's the broad. The token is sitting at the table." "Yeah, proud to be here. Thank you very much." I don't think I'm looked at as gender by most people. There are those who will always look at it as gender, and that's their problem.

H: One brother?

F: One brother. One sister. Both younger.

H: Blue collar family.

F: Blue collar family. Correct. A mother who never worked. Father who said--my husband, as I said, works in sales with a large corporation. Every time he would get a promotion, my dad would say, "You gonna quit now?" I said, "Quit what, Dad?" He said, "Quit work." I said, "Why would I quit work?" "Well, [husband's name] got a raise." "So?" "Well, that means you can quit work." There was this mentality that, well, my mother never worked. My father died, unfortunately, and left this woman--no high school diploma, no career. I mean, holy Toledo, there she is at fifty-eight years old having to support herself. What are you going to do? I think, regular family here. Never aspired to be a principal. Mathematically inclined, and back in the fifties and sixties, what did women who liked and did well in math do? They became a math teacher. God knows, you couldn't be an engineer. Seriously. You know back in those days, there wasn't a guidance counselor who said, "Boy, you're really good in math. Why don't you go become an engineer?" It was a given, I was going to be a math teacher, from the time I was four years old. I knew it, and there was no doubt in my mind. And that's what came about. Administrative thing came about later. But, I think personality came in here. I have met, and I'm sure you have, too, women who were aspiring administrators who were like pancakes. Well, God, I wouldn't hire them to be a teacher. Let alone to be the leader of my building. You know, you've got to have some personality involved here. You've got to be able to laugh. Goodness knows, a sense of humor is certainly mandatory. If somebody said to me, what's my strong point, I would say my sense of humor. You gotta have a sense

of humor, cause you gotta laugh your way through it. That's why I start the day with a joke. Kids have been known to steal my joke book--leave ransom notes. You know. "If you promise never to read a joke again, we will return your book." It's great. They love it.

H: Humor's important.

F: Oh, gotta be.

H: I think that's the only way you can make it through the day. I think we're done. We've got lots of good stuff.

APPENDIX C**Tess**

H: Tell me something about yourself demographically first. Interesting things like your age....

T: Age is not interesting.

H: And how you identify yourself in terms of ethnicity – and good things like that.

T: My background? Both my parents immigrated to this country. My father is Italian gypsy and my mother is from Mexico. I identify myself as a U.S. citizen although now reaping all the benefits of having some other multicultural background, I certainly am taking full advantage of that opportunity. I am forty-three years old and I have been in education for twenty-two years, and I have been in seven different states.

H: Why have you been in seven different states? Any reason?

T: Taking advantage of....

H: The gypsy background?

T: That's what I tell my husband. It's the gypsy background. Taking advantage of opportunities in New Jersey and in North Carolina, Minnesota, Ohio, Connecticut. It's just trying to reap and glean so that when I got an administrative position, I'd be able to implement all these wonderful things, but this particular school is not ready for all those wonderful things.

H: Tell me when you find a place that is because then I'll go there, too.

T: Stand in line. Take a ticket.

H: That's right. So, you're married?

T: Yes, married and have two dogs. Two four-footed children.

H: Two four-footed children. O.K. Been married a long time?

T: Oh, gosh, yeah.

H: Seems that way, I betcha.

T: Seventeen or eighteen years--I'm not real sure. It's been a long time. Longer than I thought I'd ever be married.

H: Longer than what you thought it'd last?

T: Yeah.

H: And this school, demographically? Tell me a little bit about it.

T: I would say it's rural-suburban, although you're hard pressed to find suburban. Doesn't really have a downtown. It's--I don't want to say a bedroom community of [specific] city. The city is filtering out into [specific] Township. We have approximately 13% students of color and pretty much everybody else is a redneck here. I thought I was coming to [specific] city--that [this school] was just a part of it and I was very surprised at the different ideologies and philosophies and sub-blue collar community that exists here.

H: Is "redneck" part of the EMIS categories?

T: Yes, I think that's number six.

H: Oh, six. I know just the place to put that.

T: I'm going to be really candid so that your research is just....

H: Rich. Rich is the word. Rich in detail. O.K. I'm here because you're female. Let's put it right out there on the line.

T: I'm really a trans-sexual. [Laughs]

H: Rich in detail. All right. Tell me something about the intersection of gender in your job. Have you ever had any little stories to tell about being female?

T: How long are those tapes?

H: Plenty long. Everybody has a story.

T: There are plenty of stories. This particular school I'm at right now, they were very surprised that a female was hired. The word around the community--the word on the street, since it's a very small community gets out even before the word is finished on the tape recorder, that one of them was hired. Not only was she one of them, but she was also one of them, which was a double whammy for them. A lot of the old power structure that was here; they have not accepted me. They will never accept a woman in a position of--I'll use the term "power." I don't see it as a power position. I see it as a leadership position, and I've had a very difficult time with that. I used to wear sneakers everyday--different colored sneakers to match my outfits, and the men could not accept it. So what I did during Lent is I wore real shoes, and I told them it was a result of Lent, and I told them that I was going to go back to sneakers. But since I'm looking for a position outside the district, I figure the school district and their entourage wouldn't really appreciate really bold pink sneakers or flowered sneakers. But they would talk about me having candy dishes around and "Oh, it's that woman" or having flowers around or just really ridiculous having nothing to do with leadership abilities.

H: How long have you been here?

T: Coming up on two years.

H: And you were an outsider brought in?

T: [Northern state].

H: Not somebody that rose through the ranks.

T: No, no. I wouldn't have lasted in the ranks here very long, and I'm going to be reassigned at the end of this year because the superintendent sees the community not wanting a woman in this position. Wanting a man. So they're going to reassign someone from the central office and then I'm going to be reassigned to his position and I said, "I'm not going to be reassigned. My vocation is to be a building administrator. It is not to play these ridiculous games that every day there's another rumor or a lie." My office is so bland now I used to put things down every month. I used to have a theme. There was a theme, and we'd carry it over to the office. For Halloween I had skeletons on a table cloth and "Oh, my God, she's a witch and she's practicing witchcraft." And this goes on and on, every month something ridiculous, and it just got to the point where I went, "Well, I'll just make it as bland as possible." It's really hard for me because you know you have to assert your personality. When you can't, then this is not the right place. And I'm committed to a dual gender team, and I brought on a lot of interns, but if a relationship is not working, then get out of the relationship.

H: And your husband's pretty flexible about being willing--being able--to move?

T: Yes. His company -- he's with [large corporation] and they've just restructured so I'm looking at a Cincinnati/Dayton/Springfield area for a position. Hopefully a city, although I realize that when you go south it gets a little bit tenser. But, I think an inner-city or an urban setting would be much more of what I'm accustomed to, growing up right outside of [large eastern city].

H: There are a lot of females down there, as a person who's really looked for those clusters, there's many in Cincinnati. But, what I have found through the research I've done is the reason they're more in the urban areas is because those jobs are less attractive. But, because you hired on to be an assistant principal, seniority dictates. I worked in Erie for a while and really feel a calling to go back to an urban situation. I taught in basically some urban situations. I was a traveler, too, evidently part gypsy. Went into this very nice suburban situation, very nice, very country, very similar to this situation, and don't really feel it's where I belong because it's very homogeneous in

their thinking. Although, I'm sure I could stay forever, in terms of their acceptance of me finally, but it's taken--this is my fifth year.

T: Oh, my gosh. I don't have five years.

H: It's taken a long time to get to that point. When I was the assistant principal, but I rose, and I think that helps, because it does--They have a little bit more time to get used to you. So, I was the assistant principal for three years and this is my second year as the principal. And I even convinced the board to hire a female superintendent. She's very different. She's more the bureaucrat, and I absolutely reject that, but, it's a good place right now for females. We're looking for three principals for next year, and I know that the community has gotten to the point that it doesn't even--I'll never say it doesn't make a difference, it does make a difference--but they accept you for who you are after five years, I think. It's a tough road to get there. Why did you choose this career path? Why did you decide you wanted to do this?

T: Administration, I assume that you are alluding to.

H: O.K. Well, let's start with education and then kind of go on.

T: In high school I had an experience where people of my kind don't get college degrees. They just wind up pregnant or as prostitutes. So I was about to prove them wrong. And each step I was about to prove people wrong, and I was going to be resilient, and I was going to defy all the little stereo-types that they had of individuals. When I was in teaching, I would always glean information. I would always be reading and collecting the freebies from everyplace and would be able to sort people, to be able to tell people where they could find some things. And I said "Hey, I could really get involved with curriculum or something like that." And because of my coaching, kids would always come in, so, I knew I had counseling. You're a disciplinarian, you're a test interpreter, all these good little things, and I decided that if I could reach not only 150 students in my class, then I could reach the entire school. So, I looked at administration. Then in moving about, and I purposely moved about so that I could work with some of the best that are out there. With an outcome based school, with the school that I worked with, William Glasser, and

with some other things, so I would be able to really be effective as an administrator. And when I got my doctoral degree, my goal was that I was going to be a principal. I didn't care where it was going to be, I was going to be a principal. And Ohio was real small, and my husband was in Columbus, so, how big can an inch be? An inch away from Columbus--so I figured, that wasn't that far at all to commute. So, I applied for a job at an education meet here, and I was successful because the superintendent, who was then leaving, wanted to hire someone from the outside to shake up the district. I was the shaker up.

H: It worked?

T: Well, it worked for him, I can tell you. I walk around with bruises all the time. I had goals in mind, but I am a gleaner. I want to now be able to put that vision in place and be able to bring it to fruition, but this is not the school district to do it in.

H: So, when you got your doctorate, you purposefully wanted to be a building level person. Do you have any desires to go anyplace else--and I don't want to say up?

T: No. I'm hoping, in my next position I can also work in a university in a part-time capacity. I said five years when I got this position--within in the next three to five years, I would like to try to get into the superintendent.

H: Oh, you would like to be a superintendent?

T: Yeah.

H: Is this your first administrative job?

T: Building principal--yes. But, I've been an assistant principal in a variety of different situations.

H: Tell me about your first one. Getting that job, did you see yourself as having a problem getting that position?

T: Actually, I transferred from [large southern university] to [large northern university], because my husband was already up [northern state], and I took a sabbatical from my position in [large southern university]. And I was doing my work and collecting information at [large northern university], and I wasn't associated with the school for three weeks and I started to get real antsy, and I started to go "God, I can't just do research. I just can't do this. I have to be involved with some other things." So I went to a school district who had just gotten a couple million dollars for outcome based education research, and went, "If you ever need anybody to sub...." I subbed for two days, and they asked me if I would finish out the year in a chemistry position. That was for a month, and then they asked me if I would be assistant principal. They liked what I was doing and how I got involved. I think the principal thought I was different than what I was. I was a passive person, and I turned out to be very assertive, and he was very surprised. He had a very difficult time controlling me, because I was my own person. And although we were a team, he didn't like that when he gave me a responsibility. I did it, and I guess he sort of wanted me to go, "Oh, I don't know how to do this, [John], would you help me?" Give me a break. I'm not that kind of individual.

H: You have a science background, then?

T: Yes.

H: You taught....

T: Biology, chemistry--started out in physical education. But, I decided I could do a lot more than--I took the easy route because I was almost convinced that people of my kind didn't go to college. I'd better take the easy route. Then I said, "This science is really interesting."

H: Did you teach physical education?

T: For two years.

H: Oh, did you? So, you're dual certified. O.K. Talk to me about how you deal with students. Maybe a little bit of the discipline part of it. Do you have an assistant here?

T: There's no assistant principal, but what I did is I brought on an administrative team. The athletic director, I deemed him as one of the associate principals, and the vocational director is deemed as one of the associate principals. And then I convinced the board that we needed to have a revolving professional growth plan for an internship. So, we have an intern and myself. So, we make up an administrative team. I worked it out so that each of us are assigned like ninth grade, tenth grade, eleventh grade, twelfth grade.

H: You took 12th grade.

T: I certainly did.

H: I knew you would.

T: I'm no fool.

H: Get them all whipped into shape.

T: That's right. If there's any problems in twelfth grade, it's curtains. You're not doing your job.

H: O.K. Talk about how you deal with students. How you see that as part of your role.

T: I was disappointed, because as an assistant principal you deal much more with kids. And as a lead building administrator you're supposed to deal more with the obstinate characters on the staff. And that's real frustrating because I really try and get involved with the students as much as I can. As far as finding out how their weekends went, if they had a sporting event, getting involved. Talking to them about their hair or just engaging. When the bell rings, I try to be visible and out in the hall and engaging with them. I'm not a screamer. One of our interns last year was a screamer, and felt this was because of the power thing, this was how you make people sort of cringe. And as a matter of fact they gave me a paddle when I first came. I keep it in the corner. But, on a humane level, exactly how I want to be treated with respect, I treat students that way.

H: Let's go down, then, and talk about the picture of the leadership structure in your school. You've talked about your administrative team in this building. How about your relationship with your superintendent.

T: I think we have a good rapport. I've always been able to be very candid with him. I think that he's been very frustrated because that I'm the first woman in the district. There have been no forerunners to me. And that he deals with a lot of flack from the Board of Education. And really the Board of Education wanted me to be reassigned. That's where the pressure came from--that we don't want a woman, especially a woman that wears sneakers. So he got a lot of pressure and he's resolved the fact now that he realizes that I'm a visionary. And even when school districts have called him in looking at other school districts, he's real frustrated. He used to be in the school district, and 90% of the staff here went to school here, and they were promised jobs when they got out of college. So, this is what they know. And he was in that situation. He left to go up the ranks in [northern state], not [northern state]--[another northern state], and when he came back, he thought that things would be different here and things weren't different.. So, he's having some frustrating times as well. And he realizes that you can't always go back, I guess, and that's real frustrating for him. We've had very open discussions about change, but he's finally brought in some technology for us. When I got here, there were no computers any place to be found. We were doing GPA's by hand. It's an archaeological find.

H: 1965.

T: It's just incredible. It really is. But, we have a good rapport.

H: How about the Board? What kind of flack do you get from the Board? And why do you think it centers on you? Or does it center on the fact you want change? Or can we factor those two things out?

T: I'm an outsider. And I think that's first and foremost. That I was brought in. And I have that East Coast Mentality. I guess I'm very open and candid, not aggressive, but I'm assertive. And they have a difficult time. They will spread rumors and innuendos, and that's not typical of small communities, because I've been in small communities

before, rather than confront you. No one confronts you. I believe in an open door policy, and I usually spend my afternoons, my last two hours of the day catching up on some things. And the staff here would rather pass notes to one another rather than actually confront you because they're afraid. They've never been asked and they've never had a voice here. So, I think it's a combination of things.

H: What kind of innuendo do they spread?

T: Oh, most of it is that she wants us to change, and she doesn't know that we want proof. They all want proof that the change that's implemented--like we tried to go to an eight period day to go perhaps the following year to a modular schedule or block schedule, and I implemented a shared decision making team. Well, they all wanted to be on the shared decision team to block my decisions. And that was real obvious from the onset, that we're going to vote against her just because we're voting against her. So, what they did is--we gave her one minute, so we're evening out all the periods to forty-three minutes instead of having eight fifty minute periods and building the master schedule and sitting down with each of the departments, and they found out that "God, we can actually lose one person in each department. Why didn't we listen to her?" Well, you wanted proof. Now you have proof. Now we're going to axe--we're going to have to RIF one person in each department, because you were such pig-headed, obstinate individuals. They're very suspicious of everything and every week I would Xerox off a real short article and put it in their boxes. They wouldn't read it. They wouldn't believe in words. We want proof. Nothing has changed here in twenty-nine years and why do you want us to change now? Well, that could be why. Surprise! We've implemented site visitations and we're going on to other schools and they're saying, "Gosh, they're doing a lot of different things here, but that wouldn't be good for us." Get 'em in, get 'em out. That's the mentality. Get 'em in, get 'em out. I interviewed in the summertime so I never had an opportunity to see the school in action, and I figured when nothing was on the walls it was probably because it was summer cleaning. Well, that's the way the school is. They have pride in the fact that this is a very surgical environment. Any change is perceived as bad, bad.

H: Evil.

T: Yes.

H: O.K. We've kind of hit the relationship with--How about your secretaries? What kind of relationship do you have with your secretaries?

T: Excellent. All the secretaries left in the buyout. This one secretary who, I deemed her as the administrative secretary in charge of all the other secretaries, that she came from the athletic department and she was very careful, she was very cautious. She had never worked for a woman before, and she didn't know how it was going to be. We talk all the time. We have a good rapport. And she's very surprised that this type of rapport could exist with a woman. Good relationship.

H: How about the custodians?

T: Head custodian has a very difficult time with me because I'm a woman. And when I go around if there's a leak--every morning, I--it's mandatory for us to have a meeting at 7:15, and we sit down and we have a meeting and he tells me what's happening--if the boiler's running, just things like that. It's gotten to the point, "Well, why is she asking me these questions all the time? She doesn't know what's goin' on." And that gets back to me and that's really a concern. And I've tried to give him more responsibility with supervising his staff. But, he just wants somebody to run the place. He doesn't want me to ask him for his opinion all the time. And that's real frustrating because the custodians really have pride in the building. Real pride.

H: It's a nice looking building. I took a little walk. Well, O.K. Let's talk about that leadership thing again. You're trying to institute some shared decision making things with the teachers.

T: Uh-huh. [Affirmative]

H: The assistant --associate--whatever we're going to call those principals--leadership team. How does that work? Do you have daily meetings? Do you meet at all?

T: On Mondays, or Tuesdays if we had off on Monday, we meet in the afternoon. We were meeting in the morning, but one of the interns has the ninth period free and I wanted him to still stay involved with what the individual did last year, so we changed our meetings to 2:15. And we just talk about what's on the agenda for the week, what's on the bulletin for the week, and who's going to cover what. Then concerns--we do roundtable--and concerns that I have administratively about a situation or about something I heard from a staff member. We also have what I deemed BATS, a comprehensive teaming for at risk students, and--that's on Fridays--where we bring together the building administrators, or the BATS, I call them, and the counselors and we sit down and talk about student concerns and other issues. The site based or the shared decision making is myself and then twelve elected staff members, elected by the staff. I would say that half of them have a hidden agenda--half of them are the informal leaders of the school. And the other half are the people who wanted to see change, and they wanted to know what was happening--what the inner circle was like, but they're very hesitant because the informal network is very assertive and can make their life miserable.

H: I can relate to a lot of what you're saying.

T: I'm sorry to hear that. No one should be put through this crap. And just because of your gender--that's absurd, that's absurd. Philosophically, they couldn't shake a stick at us, because, philosophically, none of them could even touch us.

H: Well, we're trying to go through some change. Tough row. We have the highest level of master's teachers in the state percentage-wise. The staff is very old, very educated, very well paid, very stuck in the mud. And again, they like me because I've been there long enough that I've become O.K. So, it's a very difficult thing for them to be angry at what I'm espousing, which are some of the very same things that you're espousing. They still embrace you, then, how do they do that? That's a real--Are you a person or are you this thing that is trying to get them to change? I can identify with this. It's frustrating, but it has a lot to do with the age of the people with which I'm working. I'm the baby, I'm the youngest. Well, there's one teacher that's younger than I am. So, not only--I mean--you have a

whole lot of things there, because O.K. so you're working on your doctorate and you're really well-educated and you can actually put a sentence together, but, you're still a baby. You're still young. And they just think I'm a lunatic. I'm a fringe person. I'm a radical. Whatever--and I embrace all those things, you have all those things. Next. So, I can identify with what you're going through, but, somehow, we've managed to keep it a lot friendlier than what you're experiencing. But, I think, if you came in, if you were transplanted--I really think that what has saved me is the five years and being the assistant principal and really making the kids toe the line, which they love. Oh, thank you, thank you, and then--how do I reconcile all that? You want to do some of that stuff? When we saw you as the assistant principal you were--and am--very strict with kids. And I am very strict with kids. I have very high expectations of kids. Which they always measure up to. Fine. Now we can do all these wonderful things because the kids are doing what they're supposed to be doing. Isn't it grand? So, anyway, I've been told I ruined the male teachers lounge, because they used to talk about sports and now they talk about education. When one of the teachers told me that --I'm sorry--it crucified me. "Tis the season." [Easter] O.K. Let's see what else we need to hit, then. You've talked to me about what you look like at work; that you wear sneakers, because it's practical, I take it.

T: Yeah, because I was the only one. There were no assistant principals. And it was also a lot easier to get around, because even the other people, if there was a fight, they'd all go, "Well, are you going to go?" And so, I'm not going to wear heels and be clompin' around on three stories and up the stairs, and down the stairs and things like that. I want to be comfortable. What's on your feet, you know you wear that smile on your face or you grimace walking through the terrazzo floors and things like that.

H: Wear pretty much suits?

T: I always wear a suit. Yeah, no more pants.

H: Why?

T: I never wanted to be an administrator who was a male dressed up as a female. And I think as women we fight with that all the time.

You can still keep your personality and still be a person, your own person, and do a heck of a job as an administrator. I think we damage ourself when we try and be a man, cause that's not what women are. Women are much more nurturing. They have the ability to be flexible and juggle twenty-five balls at the same time. And I think that men should be envious of us.

H: Get in line.

T: That's right.

H: O.K. Can you kind of just go through your day for me from when you get up in the morning and hit the shower, from there on? You can leave out that part if you want--leave out the personal hygiene.

T: I get up in the morning and I put on a T-shirt and my bathing suit and I go for a swim. Usually, before I get here, I swim a mile at least every day before I get to school.

H: Where do you do that?

T: At a pool in [town]. I swim there. When I had an apartment here I was swimming at [neighboring] High School. I come to work. And as soon as I get here, I've not even sometimes unpacked my bag, when people are here, you know, conversation. Talk to [secretary] and ask her how things are. They'll put the subs on my door, and I'll just try and turn on the computer, turn on the printer, and I'm out in the hall and visible. I take whatever students I have that are supposed to come in first period and I'll track down my troubled students, troubled seniors. I'll just peek my head in the room and I'll call the student out because we have a homeroom at the start of the day or just the beginning of class, I'll try and be at that door so that I don't have to call the person out of class and thereby, "-O-o-o-h." Talk to the student about the concern; assign detention or whatever is needed or just to talk to the student. Then, sometimes, peek in a couple of classrooms. I try and do at least three walk-throughs during the course of the day. I'll come back here, see if there are any pressing issues. Unpack my bag and sort some stuff. Pull out--I have a filing system of every day--I'll pull out what's in the file for the day. The superintendent will call, "I heard this rumor today--tell me

what's happening there." Respond to that. Then be out and about, answering notes, people putting notes in your box, and going around to the staff. Pretty much, the morning is gone, and I'm down by the cafeteria during the lunch periods. I think it's a wonderful opportunity to just walk around to the tables and talk to the kids. And go down to the gym because when they finish in the cafeteria, it's closed campus. They're allowed to go to the gym and beat each other over the head. So they do that in the gym. And, if it's a nice day, I'll take a walk around the building, outside the building, down to the annex. We have another section to the building on the other side of the football field. Then after that I'll usually just do another walk through, around one specific floor and then I'll come back. And usually from 1:00 to 3:00 I try to do some things in the office-- answer phone calls I need to answer.

H: What time do you leave, usually?

T: Now I can't say, "When it's getting dark" because it stays light a lot longer. If there's sporting events, I'll be out at the sporting events. Usually around 5:00.

H: Let's hit school renewal. If you could direct school renewal, no holds barred, no teachers saying, "No I don't want to go" and no money problems--go for it--what would you do?

T: I would go around to schools and observe staffs and pull teachers from different staffs who were doing innovative and creative things. I'd create a school that had a sunrise-sunset program. That's just a terminology that I use--that would open its doors to students at 7:00 in the morning and not close until 10:00 at night. It would be a school that had community flow freely in the building. That each classroom would be able to have community members as participants in the class--at least 4 or 5 community members in the building. Would be one of a lot of cooperative learning taking place. One of which there would be no bells. People would work as teams; they would work collaboratively and work on interdisciplinary projects. And it would be a lot of pride and a lot of respect for one another.

H: Should be able to do that about tomorrow, shouldn't you?

T: Isn't it a shame that that's reform?

H: Yes, that's a shame.

T: Education is oftentimes like the Vatican, just refusing to make any changes. Not going to change. We're going to go back to an industrialized society any day now.

H: What's the purpose of high school today? Why are any of us here?

T: I don't know. I think we really need to revisit high school. I really do. And revisit seat time and revisit Carnegie units and all that stuff. I think that we are secondary education, just like in Europe. And that this prepares people for their next phase in life. If somebody doesn't want to go to secondary school right now, then, let them have a job. Our purpose is to prepare people for their next phase in life. That's what secondary school should be. Not one of being punitive. Not one of having to have kids meet here for nine periods a day, and have to have a study hall and lunch and all these other things. This is preparing for life and the classroom is not life. It's everything--the community service should be a part of the school day and the high school really needs to revisit how society has changed and to prepare people, and they're not preparing people. At least, we're not here. I don't think we are.

H: What are you doing?

T: It's a baby-sitting service for parents for four years. A lot of these kids are ready to go on; a lot of them aren't. The mentality of the staff is get 'em in; get 'em out. A whole lot of--they lost some pride someplace along the line. And it didn't happen when I got here. It was probably about twenty years ago, when they wanted to clean up the act and they wanted to suppress the sixties and suppress the seventies and everything. They suppressed pride. Well, not pride because there's still pride in the building, but they suppressed any type of a voice. And that's too bad.

H: Well, O.K. Is there anything else you want to tell me that I didn't ask you that you thought, "Hey, I thought up this answer. I thought this was what she was going to ask me about?"

T: No. I didn't know what angle you were going to come from.

H: Anything else that might be what you are in this particular....

T: What I am? Gee, I guess I'm just the building principal here. I don't know what else I am.

H: Different from those that have come before? Different from those that will come after?

T: Oh, yeah. Oh, most definitely. I think that they will not appreciate the sensitivity and the candor and the honesty and the openness until after I depart. And many perceptive staff members have said that. And I said, "Well, that's fine. But, this is a bad relationship for me and I'm getting out. You guys are going to have to struggle with that." And I think that's too bad. I think that oftentimes people treat people--I won't say cruelly--but they don't realize that even though it was a transition and it was changes. It's always frustrating or it's an upheaval. It's very difficult, but that they had an opportunity. I mean, we had a Venture Capital grant. The only reason we had a Venture Capital grant was because I pushed it. I put a vision together and then got some of the key movers and shakers that wanted some change and we put it together. And we had the State Department was ready to take it away from us. We were going to be the first school in the state to have a Venture Capital grant taken away. Because they came and they said, "Oh, my God." You know it's real obvious that there are some people that when you walk by they just haven't accepted you. They're not going to accept you. What's going to happen when you leave? They did a second visit and that's when we put up these pictures all over the halls and put up posters all over the halls to make it look like at least we're not "Night of the Living Dead Zombies" here. And they said, "Well, you're doing some things and that's real positive." But, it's real frustrating, because when I leave what's going to happen? Yeah, I saw your surprise that we were Venture Capital. There's an opportunity here, and it's just not being tapped. That's too bad. The kids are the ones who suffer. Brought in a national speaker and, you know the kids realize there's tension between the senior staff, and even putting in a soda machine so the student issue would have money to generate just after school-

-little things like that. Just trying to do things for kids. The school's never been here for kids. And trying to do that--you're changing, you're changing. We just get 'em in and get 'em out. We don't want to interact or anything like that. Oh, God. On referral system, I said, "Well, you know, you need to call the parents if there's a problem." "Well, the building principal always used to call." "What a waste," I said. "If you had open-heart surgery and something went wrong in the operating room, would you want the chief of surgery to talk to the family? Or would you want the person who actually did the operation? Why would you want to engage all these other people? You know what happened. You talk to the parent. We'll handle any fights or anything like that, but if somebody doesn't bring a pencil to class--give me a break. You call the parent or don't write the referral out." I had a difficult time with that. A lot of ownership, putting it back. A lot of things like that.

H: Name a change. Have you done a change that you can really say--say a systemic change--something that everybody can go O.K., this is different? Not the little things that we know we impact on all the time.

T: Staff meetings. They used to have staff meetings go after school for fifteen minutes and the building principal would stand up and say, "This is what's going to take place." We now have a two hour late start and in these design teams that we have, fifty percent of the staff stand up and talk about things that are happening in their department, things like that. There's a twenty minute open sharing in the small groups, which has been very positive and I think will continue. Communication.

H: Not their strong suit.

T: No. So, that's what--when you go in after anybody that's been here twenty-nine years. I think that's insanity. Who went to high school here, then went to college, went to the NBA and hurt his knee, so, came back. And I'm five two. He was seven foot something. So, it was just when I first got here, I stood on a stool behind the counter so people--I said, "At least you knew that when you came in you were going to look up there so, I figured I would stand on a box." "That's stupid. She stood on a box."

H: No sense of humor, either.

T: None at all.

H: How do you survive without it?

T: It's real frustrating.

H: O.K. Glad I dredged all this up for you here so early after your vacation. I don't want you to start out after your vacation feeling too good for too long. It's too bad you're leaving, though.

I: Well, gotta go to bigger and better things.

H: Well, I really have decided that I've been at Champion too long.

APPENDIX D

Betty

H: The principal left late in the summer time and I was the assistant. Well, that's O.K. to be the assistant, cause all you have to really do is take care of kids and that's sometimes what they see us doing anyway. So, they gave me a one year contract. And I was very nervous about that, even though I had been there for years. I thought they really knew who I was.

B: What did you teach?

H: I was a band director. Not in that district. Went to be the assistant. Was the assistant for several years. Then we had a budget crunch. And the year that I was the principal for the first year, there was no assistant. A building of about 630 kids with no assistant. And it was the same kind of thing. Who's going to apply for this job? We have such a lousy situation here. So that's kind of the way that is. But, it's a very conservative, kind of almost "red neck" sort of area. But, anyway, my research has led me to discover that there's only forty-eight in the state that are actually principals. Of course, there are more assistants.

B: See, I did mine with superintendents, and it was hard for me in my research to get an accurate number when I did my interviews because, when I did my initial survey, I was asking, how many years have you served in administration? Well, that could be anything. So it was hard to get that down. And I was trying to get a list, thinking that the State of Ohio should know....

H: The gender of the people....

B: And I believe they do. I truly believe they do, and they were in no way going to release that to me.

H: Well, what I did is, I went to the Ohio Educational Directory and I picked out people who had traditionally female names. A couple of

people who I then called, I found out a Leslie was a male and Kim was a male, so I had a slightly bigger number and I started to whittle some of those people down simply because of the name thing. That's the thing I've discovered, too, when I search through the literature. First of all, they differentiate us by secondary and elementary. They do gender kinds of things, it's just total quantity. Well, yeah, tell me where they are. And they're fuzzy about that.

B: See, there's so few.

H: How many superintendents were there? Did you just do this state?

B: Yeah, I did.

H: Just Ohio?

B: There were thirty-one superintendents at that time. I finished that in '91, and I'm considering doing a follow-up, because I know at least ten of those have self-selected themselves out. And I think there's some real reasons. I don't think they did it just because they wanted to plant an urn some place. But, I analyzed statistics. There was a woman who did a study similar to that ten years prior, there were only three. So, by looking at the stats, what a wonderful improvement. Going from three to thirty-one, or whatever it was-- it's back--I probably forgot the whole study now.

H: Well, we have a female superintendent now. And one of my friends at the university is doing a gender study, too, and is trying to find female secondary principals, female superintendents in the same district. She said, 'I think you're the only one.'

B: I would say that's real unusual. My feeling is that boards don't like to have two females together.

H: Afraid we'll sit down and crochet or something.

B: So, tell me about your study.

H: Well, It's very feminist in design. It's not--I don't have really a series of structured questions. I have some ideas that I may or may not hit, depending on how the conversation kind of goes. We're dealing with cultururation and are we hegemonizing the culture? Are we not hegemonizing in the culture? Do we resist? Do we acquiesce? And really, I've had kind of a bad time getting it through the committee, who wanted a very stats kind of....

B: Whole structure.

H: All the time. But, I finally found one person that would embrace it in the admin. department and then I have somebody in foundations, because the foundations in education people are always much more 'out there.' So, I finally got it through, not all that long ago, I think in January. But, Youngstown makes you do three chapters before you can defend your proposal.

B: So does [her college]. I think that's a common trend.

H: Oh, is it? Because most of the places you do a little prospectus and then they sign off on that and then you start to write. But, these people said, "No", and one and three [chapters] are absolutely cast in stone, you can't change anything about one and three. Two they let you fudge with a little bit. But, I'm quite a ways into chapter four and then five of the conclusions, you kind of have some basic ideas.

B: So, they didn't proof the first three. You did defend?

H: In January. I've been rolling along pretty well, though.

B: So, you're interviewing people on tape....

H: And my sister-in-law is transcribing the tapes, and what they've asked is that I leave the transcriptions in the library--Maag. Of course, nobody's identified by name. We'll come up with a pseudo-name for you.

B: Are you identified demographically?

H: Yeah. Demographically and personally by district, but only in terms of urban/suburban. I mean not a lot of demographics.

B: Because, that does depend on how candid I can be. In the study, how will I be identified?

H: By a made-up name and by the fact that you're an urban/suburban principal of about--school size and all those kinds of things.

B: You don't give a geographic location?

H: No. I don't say [city name]. I don't say [directional] part of the state. In fact, I know the female at [another school] very well and when I read through her stuff, I thought, "I'm not even sure who this is anymore," because other than that she's black and she has some speech patterns. But the only person who would really know who it is would be my major advisor, who will keep the sign off sheets. You have to do the informed consent forms. Part of it, though, is that the interview is bound and put into Maag Library for anybody else who would like to go back and examine the transcripts and things like that. And then I'm just excerpting some things for the other chapter four and commenting on that, and does that fit the pattern of everybody else.

B: So, did you get someone to approve non-statistical research?

H: Yes.

B: Wow! Cause I acquiesced. Fine. You want numbers, I can give you numbers.

H: It took a lot, it really did, and only I think because I was so prepared. I had known for years that this was what I really wanted to do all through my Masters. And I had just a mound of research in my computer that I could just go and validate as we went along. And he wanted to take a risk, although, I'm probably going to be the first graduate out of this doctoral program, because this doctoral program is new.

B: What is it?

H: It's an Ed.D program out of Youngstown, but I'll probably be the first one. And I thought that was pretty brave of him to allow me to do something kind of quirky.

B: They don't have Ph.D or Ed.D program in Youngstown?

H: They just started this Ed.D program. And, in fact, that's why, really in all honesty, I'm doing it, because they paid everything for me to be able to go to have a couple of graduates in a fairly quick fashion. We went through in cohorts, though. Every year they take in twenty. So, this is my third year and I'm aiming to be done by--well, I'm aiming to be done with the writing by the end of June. Then, of course, let them beat me up as they beat you up for however long they have to beat me up. Till they're satisfied that I've paid my dues, then they let you go. But, anyway, so you're not identified other than two people know who you are. So, I think that's the first thing we need to do is have you sign off that informed consent that says you're over eighteen--all that kind of stuff.

B: Now, how did you--do you have problems with your subjects committee?

H: No, in fact they waived me.

B: They didn't give permission, but they waived you?

H: They waived the whole set--they said you're exempt from our committee.

B: Wonder why they did that.

H: Because I want so very much to not put words into anybody's mouth and to say--what is the only psychological risk to this? That somebody may turn around and reflect on something they've said?

B: You see, I made a real error, because I had such a hard time with the human subjects in filling out the paper work, I did a real tactical error. When they didn't like my answers, they said, "What physical or mental harm could come to the person who has been studied?" I

wrote down 'Paper cut from opening the envelope.' This was not a good move on my part at all. But, I got tired of them rejecting and rejecting. I thought, "Nothing." I said, "Are we afraid for them to think?" But, they wouldn't waive me. So, I did have to get final--and that paper cuts smart remark didn't help me at all.

H: Came back to haunt you. I tend to be a smartie, too, sometimes.

B: So, I learned real early, don't be a smart ass for this.

H: No, they want you to take their little games very seriously.

B: I thought the whole thing was so ridiculous. I could see if I were in psych and I was really moving with--I was just asking people's opinions.

H: Or, if you're young, if you're a child under the age--but, you're dealing with people who live with this stuff all the time.

H: Do you have a Star Trek screen? [Notes computer screen saver]

B: No, this is roaches. [Pause] Yeah, this is all roaches and bugs and I turn the sound off because it makes people real jumpy. But, every time a cockroach goes into the base it screams and it made a lot of people jumpy, so, I got rid of that. [Betty starts to sign permission form]. So, I get a copy of this also? It says you'll give me a copy.

H: I can.

B: That's what you said you're going to do there.

H: Yeah, I will. Not only that, I'm going to send you a copy of your interview so that you'll know what I said. When the paper's done, I'll send you a copy of that in case you ever get insomnia. The first question I always use is, why don't you tell me a story about the intersection of gender and this job. Any story that you can think of. Anyway that you think being a female has created an anecdote.

B: My current favorite--most are negative in nature, but a lot of humor with them--I have a female assistant, who when I was hired--

and the process here is just amazing. I interviewed with over a hundred people before I got the job. It was a whole year process, and I had no idea the person serving as an interim principal at that time, who he was and then who was the interim assistant, so they hired me, and then they hired her to continue as a regular assistant principal. And I found out later that the faculty had made bets that we wouldn't last until December because we were both female. Interestingly, but not surprisingly, we had become very quickly good friends. And we're both people who consider ourselves people who don't make close relationships very quickly, but in this case we did, and it's been a delightful relationship. It poses no problems, no challenges, but we have become very close. We became close very quickly. We have similar interests, and we're a generation apart, and that's kind of interesting, too. So, you can imagine, just as quickly, which was not a surprise at all, that the lesbian stuff didn't come far behind it. My perception was, O.K., we did get along, we didn't meet their expectation that we'd be "clawing her eyes out." We redefined leadership and team work for two females. I think that's how you do it. I think it's different. I think communication is very different. I think leadership had to be redefined. And so I think one of the very conscious attacks was, "They must be lesbians." Must be because they're running everyday. They shower together. And so, I make sure I kiss her once in a while just to--but, that's my current favorite that I like to share. Yeah, they're doin' a hell of a job and they're real good, and they're such good friends, they work so well, and they're very effective. My God, they must be lesbians.

H: Older or younger than you?

B: She's 51 and I'm 41.

H: Only assistant? One?

B: Uh-huh. [Affirmative] This is a seven through twelve building.

H: Oh, it is? How many students?

B: Four-hundred-and-nine.

H: Why did you choose this career path or did you choose this career path? Some of us just kind of fall into it.

B: Mine was very conscious. And in my study, I had an issue with females not making conscious career decisions. Males making those. I was very clear in my research that males made the clear decisions. I made a very clear decision early on that this is what I wanted to do. It wasn't serendipitous. I was teaching high school, and I started a Master's degree program my second year teaching, right out of a Bachelor's degree, in administration. The first thought came to me, and it's less than humble, but I looked around me and I thought, "Well, if these guys can do it," and I was interested in that kind of job, that kind of career.

H: Teaching what in secondary?

B: I taught special education. I was certified in industrial arts and special ed.

H: You didn't come from this school and rise? You came in from some place else, right?

B: Yeah, I've been in a number of places. This is my nineteenth year in public education, this is my fourth position.

H: You want to trace that out?

B: Yeah. I was high school principal for eight years in a high school west of here in Ohio. Prior to that I was a director of special education for four years with seven school districts in another part of Ohio. Prior to that, I taught high school for four years in another part of Ohio.

H: When you were a principal before, same kind of district?

B: Rural, but seven through twelve--small.

H: Did you have trouble getting that first administrative job, especially principal's job? What was that like?

B: It was in '79, and I knew time was up and I wanted to do it. I was tired of being in supervision and directing. It was just not what I wanted in administration. It was a good learning experience, though. I knew where I wanted to get, so, I had to figure out what the best path would be. I knew the best path would be through a rural school. And so I applied in several districts, and this is the first job that was offered. So I took it.

H: About what size school?

B: About this size.

H: About this same size. So you moved for any particular reason? Just needed a move, or....

B: Time was up. It was time to move to do something different.

H: Talk to me about dealing with students. Do you still do a lot of that even though you have an assistant?

B: Oh, yeah.

H: Describe the dealings you have with them and how--say--do the dreaded job of disciplining.

B: Well, I think my basic philosophy is that I'm a problem solver. It comes to light when we discipline students that it serves no function to say, "You have three demerits, and now get out of here." One of the reasons that I continue to choose small districts is I think you can have more impact when you can have more one-on-one interaction with kids, adults, and parents. So, especially having an assistant, that affords me--I don't do as much discipline as I did--when we do it, which is very different to them, we do it as a team. We do a lot of it as a team, which makes people crazy and very suspicious, but we feel that for serious offenses, we are more effective as a team and working together. And it's important when we're talking about expulsions or major offenses with drugs and things like that, that we can support one another and make better decisions with both of us. But, when I do the one-on-one, I try with the student to get to the

root of the problem. What are we going to do so this doesn't happen again? And try to come to some conclusions that way.

H: Are you a yeller or a nurturer?

B: That was one thing that the district complained, was very critical of me in my initial evaluation. And it's been very interesting, the way they've evaluated me here. My first evaluation, they said, "The perception the students have, and some of the parents, that you're very cold and uncaring." And I said, "O.K., that's fine. That's the first time anyone's ever told me that and I'll look at that, I'll certainly examine that, but I'll tell you some reasons that's being said." I said, "It's a gender issue." I came into this district, they were looking for a strong leader to straighten out a number of problems. For a year they were looking for this person and I believe they found it in me or a hundred people wouldn't have said that's the person for the job. So then, when I took action, there were some unpleasant decisions to make. And I don't think it was any reflection on how cold, nurturing, warm I was, I believe if it was a male in that position that they would have viewed the person as being a take-charge, being assertive. And to this day I truly believe in my heart that no one would have told someone with a penis that they were cold or uncaring. They would have said, "Good job."

H: How many years have you been here?

B: It's my third year.

H: Third year here? Continuing contract coming every five years?

B: No, I'm--they just give two years.

H: O.K., let's hit a couple more on the demographics. You're obviously white, but I need to say that for the tape. Forty-one, did you say? Married?

B: Yes.

H: How long? Long time?

B: Nineteen years.

H: Nineteen years. Children?

B: No.

H: Your husband a professional person?

B: Uh-huh. [Affirmative]

H: O.K. That's enough demographics. Tell me about the school population here as far as the kids go. This is considered a rural area?

B: This is a suburban area. Affluent. Very, very affluent.

H: Minority population?

B: Almost zero. People move here for the schools. In 1939, this high school was created because the people who lived in the estates--this is the least expensive place to live around the school--this is only a two mile village--but in the large, large estates, and most of them have been subdivided now--they had an elementary school out in [another area], and in '39 they decided they didn't want their children to go to the [city schools]. So, they founded a school. This is [large city]. Our address is [large city]. Within this pocket, this is the [a village]. We compare ourselves to fifty other schools in Ohio and some are Wyoming, Becksley in Dayton, we're in a comparison group, which I think is crazy, we're in a comparison group with Shaker Heights. I think, some things we have in common and some things we definitely don't have in common with Shaker Heights. But, it's a very affluent area. People move here because of the schools. Highly educated parents. Movers and shakers and their wives--very, very social people. This is probably one of the few districts that I have worked or will ever work where they never asked me was I gonna live here. They never asked because they knew I couldn't afford it. And jokingly some of us say, all the help comes in on a daily basis.

H: So, this is surrounded by [large city].

B: Oh, yes. If you see an aerial shot it's very interesting, just fascinating.

H: Because I noticed, just as I crossed over to [street name], it said you're not in [large city].

B: We are just--and I think it was founded because they believed the quality of education in [large city] just wasn't good enough. We have no industrial base, this is all tax supported.

H: High millage....

B: Very, very high. Not only is it expensive to own a home here, people who are living in these little houses here, if they were in Parma, Ohio, or Garfield Heights, they're like triple the price here because of the schools. And people, especially people like entry level professors at the University who really sacrifice to have their kids come here.

H: Do you measure up, do you think?

B: I do, personally. Do you mean the school? I think, generally speaking, yes. We just found out yesterday, unofficially, that we're first in the state for the twelfth grade proficiency test. Now that's very nice, but also, let's not kid ourselves, our pool is a little more enriched than others. Our superintendent is pretty savvy about that, but it's very nice that we're first in the state--but, also we have to give credit, we've got some very smart people who live here. They are focused on their kids, they come to school ready to learn. I don't do lunch programs, breakfast programs. My last school was very impoverished. 51% were low income. These kids come to school ready to learn and off and running. Which brings a whole different set of problems when they come to school.

H: You mentioned your superintendent. Talk for a minute about your superintendent. What kind of relationship do you have with your superintendent?

B: It's a working relationship. We function and produce because of common goals and believing this is a good district. And we want to make good decisions for the kids and for the district.

H: That person did not pick you?

B: Yes, he did.

H: He did pick you. Was one of the one-hundred involved in the process. But, picked you because he was here before you. And I'm getting the gender right?

B: Right.

H: Do you see this as very much of a hierarchy?

B: No, I don't view it as a hierarchy. It is, but I don't offer gifts or a lamb or anything.

H: Shared decision making? Let me ask it that way.

B: This district is, and I had to rethink, I thought I knew a lot about the group process and group decision making and shared decision making. I don't think that we take a bathroom break here without involving everybody in the decision. So, I really had to observe and learn what they call shared decision making, the group process. And initially I thought, this is not going to work because it's too cumbersome. I've learned a lot from it. When I leave here, I'll take a lot of knowledge with me.

H: Do you plan on leaving here? Is this a step in many steps, or do you kind of think you're rooted here a little bit?

B: Oh, no, I'm not rooted here.

H: Do you want to be a superintendent some day?

I: I don't know anymore. When I first started my doctorate that was the idea. There are some things I don't want to give up about building level.

H: Such as....

B: I like the interactions of all the populations. I think that's renewing and the best part about the job. It's also the worst part about the job, but it would not be difficult, and you know this, I think any position in the schools that the people with the right credentials wanted, they could get some place in Ohio. There are just so many jobs and opportunities right now. So, I would say, ten years ago it would have been a case of there's not the opportunity and there's few, few places that are. Now there are just so many openings, so now the choice is very conscious. And there are things that just don't appeal to me about that level.

H: How was your husband able to move with you? That doesn't cause problems lining up your jobs?

B: We haven't moved.

H: Oh, you've never moved.

B: No, we both drive over sixty miles a day to get to work.

H: And your other job was somewhere close enough....

B: It was. We don't view travel as a big deal. We made conscious decision not to. We had talked about, if we had to, that we would each live in different cities. We decided, we don't want to do that.

H: I traveled from Youngstown to Berea for two years.

B: Oh, is that a jaunt.

H: About 90 miles.

B: Yes, that's a real jaunt. What were you doing in Berea?

H: I was the band director in Berea for two years. Until I really just couldn't take the drive anymore. I also started on my Masters at

Youngstown to become an administrator. When I did so, I kinda--I can't drive here and go here.....

B: That would be crazy.

H: It was interesting. I can see what you look like at work, but, talk to me about what you look like at work and why you look the way that you do. I can see you have on a business suit and all those kinds of things. Do you ever think about why you look like you look?

B: I typically don't look like this. When I first started administration, I went out and bought five old man suits, and I keep them for a memory. I got them in Ann Arbor at a tailor shop. I thought this was the way to do it. And my husband would say, "You might as well wear the same one everyday cause they all look alike." So, I was really feeling bad--I was younger and that was real important to me. And, I did it for a long time--I dressed like that.

H: Slacks and the whole thing?

B: No. These were little skirt suits. You could have put this on a small man and just put a skirt on. And they're beautifully tailored. They're hanging in the closet still. It's a shame I won't wear them. Now I'm in this place that I don't like to do dolly-dress-up very often. And it's interesting, when I do the dolly-dress-up and the heels like this--I call this currently--the compliments I receive from people is just incredible, just incredible. And when I don't wear my suit and my heels, I think I look just fine. I always wear a blazer. That I wear it with a loose fitting dress and flat shoes and tights, and I can step back and say, "It's a different kind of fashion, but it's still very professional." It's not wearing nose rings, and it's very acceptable, but I find it fascinating, absolutely fascinating, if I put on a pair of shoes like this that aren't flat and a suit like this, the response I get is just fascinating. I had one faculty member two years ago, he saw me coming in one day and he said, "Now, that's how I want my principal to look." Thanks for sharing.

H: Why do you think you made the shift from the tailored suit? Is there a paradigm shift mentally that went along with that?

B: Yeah. I think it was a paradigm shift. I figured out that I didn't have to be a miniature man. That I could embrace being female.

H: But, they want you to wear that suit.

B: It's just a hoot, I'll tell you. In this community, a lot of the meetings are in people's homes. And these homes, I can just get lost in these people's homes. And we had this PTO meeting at 7:00 in the morning, and it's very humorous to me because people are complaining how early they had to get up. I've been up since 5:00, and you look like you travel. I walked in today and grabbed a cup of coffee and we sitting down. "You look pretty nice today." "What, did I look like a pig yesterday? I thought I looked pretty nice yesterday, myself." That's what I want to say. My God, I really liked what I looked like yesterday. So....

H: That's funny. But, I get the same kinds of comments. I dress like this. [Indicates relaxed attire] You have too much boogie'n' to do.

B: I can't run around like this. I love the first day--it's such a nice cycle to be on--when the teachers are gone, the kids are gone, and I can drag out the socks, my working socks and my denim skirts. I keep a blazer in my closet just in case someone does need something that I have look good, but I just love it. But I just knew--now I probably, in some ways, could get away with that look more often. I did institute a casual day on Fridays for my own personal benefit. So, we all look like--the superintendent says we all look a little sloppy over there on Fridays. I said, "You know, we are just comfortable over here on Fridays."

H: And he was comfortable with that?

B: I don't think he likes it. I really don't think he cares for it.

H: See, we do that. And then if you wear jeans on Friday, you have to give fifty cents to a charity. We got some money for that and got some publicity, so the superintendent didn't scream too much, but you're always finding an angle.

B: My angle was, “[Superintendent], they’re doing this in all the corporations now.” That’s what sold him.

H: That sold him? I should have tried that and saved fifty cents.

B: Of the major corporations, many of the presidents live here, so there’s a real strong focus on what the business is doing, you know, what the corporation is doing. So, I figured, I use it for everything else, I’ll use it for this.

H: O.K. So, the leadership structure in the school is team effort? And you feel that everybody is pretty equally empowered. How about the other principals in the other buildings? There would have to be one other building, the elementary, is that all? Just one other? Do you have team meetings and that kind of stuff?

B: Uh huh. [Affirmative] We have administrative meetings. We’re all in power here.

H: Everybody’s in power.

B: Everybody’s in power. EVERYBODY’S in power.

H: Empowerment is the word.

B: Yes.

H: O.K. Well, we talked about the superintendent. Talk about your secretaries. What kind of relationships do you have with secretaries?

B: A wonderful one. I’ve been through this three times now, so I know, and I think the secretary is very nervous, you see it in their eyes. You know, “I have worked for so and so for this many years, and please don’t think a woman’s going to tell me what to do.” My last secretary did say that. I can understand that. I can truly understand that. They’ve never had the experience. They think it’s going to be something horrible. I think we do more shared decisions, and I’m into this stewardship delegation that I’m not going to tell you how to do it. This is the end product I need. You figure out how to do it. And she is just incredible. And that means that I have to like--just

because I haven't--at that particular time of the year that I don't like Chicago type printing, or if she wants to use it in a letter, it doesn't make a rat's ass bit of difference. So, I gotta keep my mouth shut, but I find that works very well with her. I think it's a real sharing type of relationship. And even though we've never talked about it, I think it's because we have that shared experience being females that makes many of the things happen.

H: How about the custodians? I assume they're probably not females.

B: Right. That was a different story all together. Because up until January I was a supervisor of grounds in addition--a supervisor of grounds and custodians. That is always a rough and rocky road. Now I am assured that the custodians in any building will give anybody a rough road. It's interesting, internationally that custodians are hard to deal with. But, they certainly will probably never buy into this. And that's O.K. Just do your job and then you don't have to like it. So, that's one of those things you give up.

H: So, you don't supervise them directly anymore?

B: Well, yeah, I gave that to my assistant to do. I said, your attention to details is much better than mine is. You do it for awhile. I've had it.

H: Do you involve them in shared decision making, too?

B: When it comes to their areas, yes. We both agree that we have been less than successful and we laugh about it, because they don't want to do it the way that we want to do it. It's an area that in some ways is not important at all, but in some ways, it really is. And she just went through this--when we had our holiday--"How would you like to clean the building?" And I said, "Oh, for Christ's sake, just clean the building." And so she really tried, and it was just a flop. We're still trying to get these offices cleaned. I think they thought, "Fine. You want our decisions on this, we're not going to settle." We still haven't figured that one out, and we will.

H: You're right, though. Custodians are usually a problem. O.K. Why don't we just talk about your day from the get-go. Out of the

shower--from that point forward. Do you take the call-offs, or does your secretary take the call-offs?

B: A blessing. She takes them. I get real whiny when she's on vacation or something and I have to do it. For eight years, I did it. How do you do it?

H: I do it.

B: Isn't it horrible?

H: I had to buy a cellular phone to take in the shower with me.

B: How big is Champion?

H: I have about fifty-two teachers.

B: I hated doing it. Absolutely hated it.

H: Oh, it's a nightmare, but I feel badly, and I will not dump it on my secretary who I feel is overworked and underpaid as it is. So, I just keep sucking it up.

B: They do pay. She gets paid extra for calling.

H: See, if the district would buy into that, then I would feel O.K. about it.

B: I would never expect her to do it unless it were paid. And what they pay her here is just so low. I get up, get dressed, stop for coffee, come to work....

H: About what time are you here?

B: I'm here by 7:15. I either come directly here, or if I have a 7:00 meeting, go there first. I'm pretty structured in my appointments. This job, and I knew going into it, but I didn't believe it, though, is--more that any place I've been--more meeting with people. These are people who own their own companies--have their own practices. So, they have the latitude to come in and make appointments. And one of

the most challenging things is, I'd rather have this than have parents not coming in, but they're in all the time. And do, I may meet with five or six parents a day. And so, that's your day. That's a lot of it. A lot of meeting with parents, also the director of special education from districts. I do a lot of work with that. In the shared disciplining of kids, I'm involved with that. I observe teachers. I keep a real high profile when I'm not in here. Every morning, I make a point of saying good morning to every teacher. That's why these heels don't make it. If I have flat shoes, I can zip around. And because of the distance involved, any activities, I just stay. So, I don't go home. This season--I love this season because the weather's crummy--because baseball's canceled. And I say things like "A-h-h-h," and "Yes!" So I can make it home at a decent time. But, during fall and winter, I usually get home at around 10 or 11.

H: Do you have soccer here?

B: Yes. We have seventeen varsity sports. A lot of varsity sports.

H: About the same, then.

B: Yeah, we have them all. Now field hockey.

H: Everything there is.

B: Plus, the musical and the concerts, and everything else that we do. Plus, it's a very active--it's a very involved community. So, there's a task force. You know, we just have a task force for everything.

H: Lot of meetings to go to?

B: Yeah, I do have a lot of meetings.

H: Do you have to do any EMIS stuff? See, I'm the district coordinator for EMIS.

B: You should talk to my assistant. She's the district coordinator. And she's very good with it. My last district, we shared it. I did a lot of it. I was very glad just to give up ownership of that thing. So, she does it all. She delegates it.

H: O.K. If you could direct school renewal--no money holds or anything like that--what would you do? Free reign. Nobody telling you, no. No hierarchy. No parents going--how could you do that to my kid?

B: Probably, I'm in this conservative swing right now, I would probably become more fundamental and more structured. Which is different that what I would have said five years ago.

H: Why do you think that is? You're listening to Rush in the morning?

B: Never, never! I think it's because I've been at this long enough and I see everything going in cycles. And I am fascinated why people learn and how they learn. I think there are certain things that are conducive to learning and some things that aren't. I say that when you say that there are no restraints whatsoever, and I think that if you don't have parents on you, if you have the kids totally under your responsibility, and have a wonderful staff, and you all share the same vision, anybody can learn. And I think that you have to eliminate a lot of the distractions to have it take place. So, you would probably allow for a lot of creativity, but also, in our world today, you have to know certain things. You have to know how to problem solve, and I think you need some structure and less interruptions that we have in school.

H: Interruptions from what?

B: Societal interruptions. I don't mean the announcements. I just think we have too many other things that schools have picked up. I don't have children, so, I don't know if this has anything to do with it, but I can't imagine that I would ask a public entity to parent my children. And I think that we're so distracted by necessity, to help parent, that takes so much of our day. We didn't have to parent, look what we could accomplish. So, I think I'm just older and I'm seeing more things that could be done, and I think it's a travesty when kids don't learn. I think every kid can learn.

H: So, what is the purpose of school today--high school?

B: This one has a very specific purpose. But, generally speaking, I believe it's a culturalization. Preparation for the world beyond.

H: What's the purpose here?

B: The purpose here? This is college prep.

H: Everybody goes?

B: 95% go. The parents and the kids--most of them--have a really strong feel, as opposed to other districts I've been in or in talking to other principals, that this is not terminal. This is just a step on the path to something else. So, it's a very important step, very very important, because our kids go to school all over the United States, but it's just part of it.

H: What kinds of things do you offer here? Any vocational classes? OWE or any of that kind of thing?

B: We don't offer any of that. But, we have access to all those through neighboring schools. We're in a vocational district with another district. We have two students right now in vocational education. We're tied in with the county with programs like GED and those kinds of things. We offer anything to anybody. But, right here, it's pretty much an academic program.

H: O.K. Do you have anything else that would give me a good picture of you?

B: Let me think.

H: Anything I forgot to ask so you can bail me out here?

B: I don't know. Not in relation to this study. I can't think of anything.

H: O.K. I think we have a lot of good stuff.

APPENDIX E**Sally**

H: So you came in 1989. You came from a middle school in [Largecity].

S: Yes.

H: Is it done on a seniority kind of basis here? Is that the way that people rise for the most part? Or is there any rhyme or reason to how that goes? Or is it like every place else, is it luck?

S: I think a little of all of the above. I came in the middle of the school year which was a little unusual, at spring break time. Not exactly the middle, but during the school year. 88-89, so I came in April of 89.

H: And you had been a middle school principal in [Largecity].

S: Right. I had been a middle school principal for about nine years at the time that I was promoted, I guess promoted, to the senior high.

H: Had you been an assistant or anything before that or were you out of the classroom?

S: No, I came up through the ranks. Classroom, serving as a guidance counselor, and from guidance counselor went to the administrative intern program.

H: Oh, you have an intern program in [Largecity].

S: At that time we did have. Then from the intern program, I was promoted to an assistant principal, and from assistant to principal of the middle school.

H: So, you were never the assistant at a high school, you came right from the middle school to a high school--O.K. So, how many years have you been in administration altogether?

S: I think somewhere around 21.

H: M-m-m, long time.

S: Not counting my counseling, guidance years.

H: Oh, you were a counselor before that.

S: Yes. My degree is actually in guidance and counseling.

H: I think that's helpful, though. Sometimes I wish I had one of those degrees. So you were actually in the classroom and then you went to guidance?

S: Right.

H: Then you went to the administration part of it?

S: Right.

H: What was your area when you taught?

S: Science. I was a biology teacher.

H: Were you? There's more women, and that's just off the top of my head, I think there are more women that came out of science to administration than anything. I came out of the arts. That's a little different. I was a band director at the high school level for a long time and I think that gives you a lot of exposure publicly and that's also an easy shuffle in, I think. Well, let's get a couple of my questions that I have to ask you, then. Let me start out by asking you if there's a story you can tell me about how gender intersects with this job. Have you ever had anybody come up and make a comment, or do you have any kind of a story about being at the League meetings, all those kinds of things, where the particular issue of your gender intersected with your role as principal?

S: No, other than as you can tell, I have a very low voice, so a lot of times, I'm mistaken by telephone as a male. And a lot of times

people, thinking that the principal is a male, just automatically assume then my voice--more or less accept that fact. So, I've had occasions where people come in and see me for the first time and they're expecting this robust male....

H: You have to be robust....

S: And here I am this little old lady--little old lady--and they just really cannot put it together. You?

H: So, you're heading toward retirement, huh?

S: Oh, yeah, one year.

H: Oh, one year.

S: Right.

H: And that'll be your thirtieth?

S: Well, it can be. In fact, I can retire this year. But, I am looking toward another year based on what they have coming down the pike for next year.

H: And that is....?

S: I don't know.

H: Oh, I see.

S: It could be anything.

H: They could shuffle you.

S: Right. So....

H: I see. Schools up here consolidate?

S: Well, they're closing and, of course, when schools begin to close, then it impacts on other schools. Those of us that are remaining open,

and that's why I'm concerned in terms of what impact it's going to have on our school in that we are in a redesign mode at this point. And we certainly hope it won't impede or alter our plans.

H: O.K. Did you choose this career path or did it just happen on you? Did you make a conscious decision that this is what you wanted to do?

S: I think it just happened. I know I didn't choose it. I was chosen for it to an extent. I chose to go into teaching. And at that time, my only plan was to teach. Having been in teaching, and was fairly successful, I like to think, as a teacher, and did enjoy. Got a lot of self satisfaction out of it. And was advised and encouraged by my superiors, my supervisors, and those I worked with and under, to pursue other--that I should go further.

H: How about getting that first job? You were picked for that first job, your first administrative job?

S: Well, I was in counseling--and it's been a long time ago--19-20 years ago--I was head of the guidance department at this middle school, and it seems that I have always been chosen to go into schools where there are problems. And at this time they were having a problem at one of the other middle schools, a young man had just been killed, and at that time it was before the era of the gangs in schools as we know it today, but this particular school was a little out of control. And they needed to send someone there, so they asked me to go there. I guess I had earned a reputation of being a disciplinarian. So they tapped me, so to speak, to go to this one school. That's when I was put in as an administrative intern, and that was my first administrative experience and position. Much like the same way I came here. I mentioned that I came here in the middle of the school year, at the time when the school was in terrible--they asked me to come here. I guess, if I have a story to tell, that is a story.

H: That you're tough. O.K. Well, how do you deal with students in disciplinary situations?

S: Well, I like to think that I'm very fair. An old cliché, but very assertive. I've always felt that students want to be disciplined. They

do not appreciate being allowed to just go with no sense of direction. And I think they respect and they appreciate people who have those kinds of expectations for them. So, I've always worked on the premise that you let students know what your expectations are, and they will live up to it. Those that don't, then you deal with those. And that's the only thing that allows us to continue to be in control. There's no way that one person or one administrative staff or one staff in a school could control kids if they didn't want to be controlled. We have close to a thousand kids here with a staff of eighty people, who has the advantage? So, that's the premise that I work on.

H: Kind of a loud type of disciplinarian, or sort of the soft spoken?

S: Can be. Not so much anymore, but can be.

H: But your reputation starts to precede you after a while.

S: That does happen, especially when you stay in the same district. Which may or may not--and I find that after this many years in the district, I'm now dealing with the children and the grandchildren of kids that I taught. And since I have stayed, more or less, within the same perimeters of the city, I'm running into a lot of that. So, my reputation does precede.

H: I remember her, she did that to me. Do you have a handbook and things like that you follow? And that's given to the students?

S: Yeah, I feel that's very important. I work on the premise of letting students know what the expectations are. It's this, this, and this. And making sure that they accept that.

H: Pretty progressive type thing. You do it the first time--this. You do it the second time....

S: Yeah, that's right.

H: Talk to me about the leadership structure in your school district. Which would be kind of different for you, I think, than for anybody else that I've talked to right now.

S: You mean today or last week or maybe next week? It changes.

H: Do you have any kind of relationship with the superintendent?

S: Which one? Anybody who works in [Largecity], one thing we know we're very good at and that is adapting to change because we really have to undergo them. I can't even remember--I think now since--I started in 1964--I don't know how many superintendents I have experienced in that time. It has to be a record number.

H: Oh, I'm sure, so, I suppose you're kind of a final voice, though, for kids. Nobody goes and appeals anything to the superintendent in this school district, do they?

S: Sure, lately they do.

H: And they have hearings in front of the superintendent just like they do....

S: Well, you know, with the structure of the district, each superintendent brings in a different set of ideas of how the district should run--how schools should run. Parent involvement--community involvement--has been a real push for the last six, seven, eight years. In order to get that across, the district has sort of relinquished, this is only my, this is [my] concept, of what's going on. But, they have sort of tried to appease parents without having them take on any of their responsibilities. So, consequently, parents find it's very easy for them to question decisions that you may make or actions that you may take as it relates to their child in particular or as it may relate to students in the building, in your school. So they feel very quickly that they can go downtown. And they use that as a means of manipulating or intimidating to get their way or to have you change your way or to change your mind or your thinking. So, they will very quickly go downtown, so to speak.

H: Do you have principals meetings in a district this size? Everybody gets together once a month?

S: Right. [Student interruption.]

H: Same everywhere--my needs, my needs.

S: Yeah. I have two assistants and....

H: Yeah, but it's you. They want you. So you go down once a month?

S: Yeah, we have a monthly principals' meeting with the superintendent. Then as a result of that meeting, we may or may not have a divisional meeting without an immediate supervisor which is an assistant superintendent for high schools, or an assistant superintendent for the middle schools or for the elementary schools. So, we all meet together with the superintendent once a month and then in turn we may meet without assistant superintendent for our particular level as a result of that meeting.

H: This particular person, they kind of have shared decision making ideas or do they have the idea that there's a hierarchy there and they're going to tell you what to do? What kind of structure?

S: Who are you talking?

H: The present one that you have right now, the superintendent.

S: [Superintendent]. Well, he's appointed by the state, so this is a whole different kind of thing. The board, the school board, now is left out of the decision making, so to speak. Before we were working with the superintendent who was hired by the school board and reported to the school board. The school board made most of the decision making, but now I guess we are under the state. I don't know.

H: Does it make any difference? Maybe it does....

S: As of now, it really hasn't made much difference. It's sort of like business as usual. I guess they're more or less, I think their concentration is more or less on what's going to happen for the next school year. And I think this school year is just sort of finishing out. Status quo, so to speak.

H: O.K. What's your relationship with your secretary?

S: My secretary in my building? I have a principal's clerk who is supposed to be the head clerk, and I have a senior clerk and I have two junior clerks.

H: And you call them 'clerks' rather than 'personal secretaries' or anything?

S: They are clerks.

H: That's what you have.

S: I think, maybe if we called them secretaries, we might get better results.

H: They take care of money issues largely, perhaps. Is that....?

S: Why are they called clerks rather than secretaries, is that what you're trying to distinguish?

H: I guess.

S: I don't know.

H: You don't have your own secretary. I can't believe that.

S: No, I don't, but I think that's something I need to do.

H: Let me talk to your superintendent. You need a secretary.

S: I guess that's something that--I need to make that decision. The organization of the building is not dictated to us. We're given a certain amount of personnel. We're allocated a certain amount of personnel based on the enrollment, how many students you have and the size of the building. So, we in turn can use that allocation according to the structure of the school, organize the school.

H: So, they give you two assistant principals, though, you don't get to decide how many assistant principals you have.

S: No, that's by formula.

H: Student population.

S: Right. In order to get three assistants, you must have at least 1200 students.

H: And that's how many you have? Three assistants?

S: No, I have two. I have 900-and-some students.

H: If you could get it up there a little bit, you get another one.

S: Well, now I have to make sure I stay above 900 so I can keep two assistants.

H: Oh. There wouldn't be enough if you didn't have two.

S: If I fall down to 898-899, then I'm in trouble.

H: Oh, my. Count your clerks. That's interesting. Tell me about your school day after you get up and shower, we'll take that as a given. Do you have to take call-offs into this building or does somebody do that? Is it just too big of a job--like a clerk or a secretary?

S: I don't think it would make a difference. I would only do that if it would make a difference in teachers coming to work or not coming to work. I have heard principals say they do it and they think it makes a difference. That teachers' more reluctant to call in if they have to talk directly to the principal. I have enough trouble getting here. I would not want them calling me at home. I would have to have somebody there to take the calls.

H: Somebody has to do that. It's terrible. I carry a phone into the bathroom with me. It's terrible.

S: I'm sure. Oh, you have them to call you.

H: I have to have them to call me, there's nobody to do that.

S: Oh, no, we have a clerk who reports in at 7:00 and the teachers are expected to call between 7:00 and 7:30 and they call the school. The only people I have to call me are my assistants. I ask them to call me at home if they're not going to be here. That's in case I'm planning not to come, I'll know that they're--so that everybody won't be out at the same time.

H: What do you do when you get here? What's the first thing you do?

S: Scream.

H: That you're happy you're here.

S: Usually I have a whole bunch of folks sitting out there waiting for me to come. See I serve as a unit principal also.

H: That means?

S: It means, I have a unit of students that I am directly responsible for. Our school is divided into three units headed by a principal or unit principal. And I have two assistants. The beginning of the school year, we had about 1100 students enrolled here. And I felt that it was too much--1100 students were just too many students for two people to be responsible for. So, I decided I would take a unit. So, I take the twelfth graders. The twelfth graders are mine plus we have a special program called the Academy of Finance and we have about three hundred students assigned to this academy. And I take the vocational. So, I have about 600 students, no, I can't have that many....

H: You hope not.

S: No, I'm overworked.

H: But, I notice you take the seniors. We'd all take the seniors if we--cause we kind of have them whooped into shape by the time they're seniors.

S: Well, I tell them, "I took you because I don't expect to have any discipline problems. So, I'm not going to deal with that. I take you and I'm here to help you and advise you and to make sure you get all the information you need and that you have what you need heading toward graduation." And it works out pretty much that way. I would say less than 10% of my time is spent with discipline. Usually in our school, we find when a student gets to eleventh or twelfth grade, these kids have made a real commitment to trying to graduate. Our problem is that we don't get a large enough percentage of them making that commitment.

H: About what percentage, do you think?

S: Out of a class of ninth graders of 500 ninth graders, we'll graduate a hundred-and-thirty four years later.

H: That's too bad. Do you observe teachers and do all those kinds of things? Recommendations?

S: You asked me, "What was my day like when I come in?" I come in. I usually check to see how many teachers are going to be absent; check to see if we have subs for them. If not, get in touch with department chairs to be sure that they know that their teachers are out and that they are covering the classes. Have parents--most of our parents who come in for conferences come in the morning--we have a group of parents who are always sitting there. Some not too happy because you asked for them to come in and they are rushing wanting to get to work or whatever. So, you're trying to have this conference and you've got one out there prancing around and wanting you to hurry up, but I do find that parent conferences are very important when you're having difficulty, having any problems or concerns with kids, you must get the parents involved. So, I just have to insist that the parents come in and it works very well. It's according to what time of year. At the beginning of the year it's very hectic because I'm having to get these parents in. Then, they get the message that I'm going to have to have them in, so then they'll get their kids together so that they don't have to come to school. That's O.K. with me.

H: If it works, that's good.

S: So, as the year progresses, then the parent conferences lessen. As you can see, I don't manage well.

H: Neither do I, so that's O.K.

S: This is what I leave, so I leave this till Saturday, because I used to come in on Saturday mornings to clean my desk up and discover all those things that got lost under the piles of paper. This is great compared to what it usually is. I won't even have to come in this Saturday.

H: This is a day off.

S: So, basically by that time, by parent conferences, I guess, and getting kids back into school, take up about the mornings. And then by that time it's lunch time. Our lunch periods, of course, are our most unstructured time and where kids need the most attention. So, I try to help out where I can. And, I'm monitoring the halls and making sure the kids are on task, doing what they need to be doing. And other times I spend a lot of time with teachers, committees. We're in this redirect, refocusing, five-year strategic planning, and so we're spending a lot of time with that. I do most of my paper work after school. School is out at 2:40, and I never plan to leave except on bowling. I have one bowling night. Everybody knows I bowl on Monday, so they know that I leave early on Monday, but otherwise I'm usually here until 4:30. That's when I try to get bulletins written. There's still a lot of work that people feel is female work. Like writing bulletins, the guys don't want to sit down and do that kind of stuff. But, they're learning.

H: Little choice.

S: Yeah. I usually return calls after hours.

H: I think this is an important one for you. If you could direct school renewal, what would you do? Start over again, no money problems, plopped in the middle of Shangri-la, what would you do?

S: Well, we're doing a lot of that now. I don't know what I would do. I would have to change my way of thinking about a lot of things because now we find we make do too much because we don't have the resources, especially the money resources available to us. I guess we've been so used to making do that I don't even know how it would feel to have everything available. The technology, I feel that we could do so much more with technology than what we're doing. The first I would do would be to secure my building. I would secure the building so that those of us who must be here would not have to have that as a concern in terms of our safety and well-being. And I think it could be done very easily if we had the money to do it. Then I think the next thing I would do would be to just clear it out. I would love to have the chance to be selective in the people. Putting people into key positions that I would need in order to make this thing go. That's not going to happen.

H: Probably not.

S: I would do away with the union agreement that strictly impedes the progress and impedes our ability to work successfully with our students. I believe in unions. I think everybody needs to have a sense of worth and a sense of safety as far as their job's concerned, but I think a lot of that stuff is not necessary. I think the union agreement just really allows for a lot of inequities to take place. It supports a lot of inefficiency, a lot of things that hurt kids. I don't even need money to do that. I'd just clear that out.

H: Power.

S: Right. And I would take teachers who deserve it, and I do have some who are very deserving, they need to be rewarded monetarily and recognition wise and the whole bit because we just don't do it. We reward baseball players and basketball players, we never reward our teachers, which I think they deserve it.

H: What's the purpose of high school today?

S: High school now?

H: Why are we all here?

I: It's a meeting place. It's a social place. It's where they come to show off their latest hair styles and their clothes, and meet their friends. And then, after they do all of these things, if there's any time left, they give a little consideration to the fact that they need to learn something. I don't know. Why are we here?

H: What would you like the purpose of high school to be? What do you think it should be?

S: I think it should be a place where we are taking kids and helping them to become well-rounded individuals, well-rounded adults. I say well-rounded. I think there is a lot of place for the fact that we have to teach them how to be social beings, that's going to be important in their lives as important as knowing the date of the founding of America. I mean, that's important, too, but my desire would be to have a sense of making them become people oriented so that they would be better citizens and would know how to get along with each other. It just bothers me that kids now just, there's no appreciation for each other. Life just has no meaning to them. I don't know if it's a sign of this particular area, this environment that they're coming out of, or if that is something that's true nationwide. I kind of feel it's a nationwide thing. I feel for young people now-a-days, I really do.

H: Do you ever think about why we look like what we look like when we come to work? Does that have any meaning to you?

S: Yeah, I think we have an obligation to set an image. I'm very conscious of how I look, and I feel I have an obligation to do that. We try to teach kids to be ready for--I just had a thing this morning with a group of students that we're getting ready for summer internship. Talking about an area saying, "Well, I like this style, I want this style." I said, "I like style, too, but I don't style to come to work, I wear appropriate clothes to work. I style when I'm on my own time. You have to style when you're on your own time. When you go out in these corporations, you've got to go looking the way that they expect you to look." They don't understand that, and I think we have to set the example. I can't say to them, "There is a proper way to dress or what we perceive as proper," and then come looking otherwise. It

may or may not be, and as you look around. Society Bank is our partner--corporate partner-- and I remember when I first came here, you would never see one of those people come in unless they were dressed in their suits and shirts and ties, but they have more down days now than I thought they would ever have--where they can go to work casual. So I think it's just a sign of what is happening in society. I guess there used to be a time when you were expected to dress a certain way according to the position that you held, but I don't know that that's so true now.

H: Kids make you question that sometimes. How do you think all these--try to sort through all the other demographics--the fact that you're in a different kind of situation certainly than I am in--a big school--I mean, I have about 600 students, but it's the only high school in the township--and I have a very different kind of relationship with my superintendent than you have with yours, but if we could sort through all those kinds of things, how do you think just that issue of gender impacts on you? Do you think it impacts on you at all? Do you think it impacts on perceptions that others have of you? Kind of a blanket statement if we could factor out everything else--and I don't know how we can factor out everything else.

S: Well, you know, I've been around long enough to have been a part of it when there were no women in high schools and very few in the middle schools in the top position, certainly very few in the central office or almost none, and I've seen it evolve over the years. I'd like to think that we have made our point. I think that we have proven that it's not all brawn, the job doesn't call for that. And I think at one time I had some reservations of my ability to do the job just based on the fact that I wasn't strong. Looking at it from a physical standpoint, I know when I first went--my first assistant principal's job, I'm going to this school where it was totally out of order and people were afraid of the kids, I thought, "Why would they send a woman? Why would they send me in here?" But, I think people appreciate you for the ability to do a job. And I think that we really have to prove that we can do the job. I think more people are willing to sit back and say "Well, let's see what's going to happen before I join that band wagon, or I'd be willing to get on the band wagon." And I think strictly from some preconceived idea about the ability to-

-I think it was looked at from a physical standpoint rather than the ability, I would say, of an intellectual/academic ability to do it.

H: It's almost like they expected at one point to wrestle them to the ground.

S: Yeah, right.

H: Left over from the days of paddling, do you think?

S: Right. I was part of that. In fact, that was one of my strong points.

H: You were good at that? I didn't get into it until that had gone.

S: I golf. I used to think that I put a lot of wrist action into my golf stroke, and that carried over to the paddle. That was very comical, because people judged your ability to paddle by your size, and any time I would hit someone with the paddle, it was always surprising to them that someone as small as I am, and at that time I was small, I'm not so small anymore, not only short in stature, but I was always so very small. Surprise, I think that was the main element. Parents and people I run into now, they still talk about the fact of how meaningful that part of my job was.

H: "I remember that you could hit." Are you married?

S: No.

H: Single?

S: I'm divorced.

H: Children?

S: No.



APPENDIX F

Youngstown State University / Youngstown, Ohio 44555-2377
Office of Grants and Sponsored Programs
(216) 742-2377

March 1, 1995

Beth Hargreaves
Department of Educational Administration
UNIVERSITY

Dear Ms. Hargreaves:

The Human Subjects Research Committee has reviewed your proposal, "Women in Secondary Administration," (HSRC #95-21) and determined that it is exempt.

We wish you well in this study.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Peter J. Kasvinsky'.

Peter J. Kasvinsky
Dean of Graduate Studies

kb

c: R. Beebe, Chair of Educational Administration
S. Ellyson, Chair of HSRC