Dissertations

Graduate College

4-1974

A Comparison of Personal Characteristics and Leadership Styles of University Upper-Management and Middle-Management Women Student Personnel Administrators

Marilyn Schlack
Western Michigan University

Recommended Citation

A COMPARISON OF PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS
AND LEADERSHIP STYLES OF UNIVERSITY
UPPER-MANAGEMENT AND MIDDLE-
MANAGEMENT WOMEN STUDENT
PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS

by

Marilyn Schlack

A Dissertation
Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment
of the
Degree of Doctor of Education

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
April 1974

A COMPARISON OF PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND LEADERSHIP STYLES OF UNIVERSITY UPPER-MANAGEMENT AND MIDDLE-MANAGEMENT WOMEN STUDENT PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS

Marilyn Schlack, Ed. D.

Western Michigan University, 1974

The purpose of this study was fourfold: (1) to outline the major trends in leadership behavior studies found in the professional litera- ture, (2) to sample female student personnel administrators on university campuses in the United States to note leadership styles of upper-management and middle-management administrators, (3) to gather pertinent biographical data about these two groups and finally (4) to compare these two groups of women to see whether there were differences in their backgrounds and behavior.

Two questionnaires were used in the study. The Biographical Questionnaire requested information items in four areas. The areas were personal characteristics, professional characteristics, job characteristics and job opinions. The second questionnaire the women administrators were asked to complete was the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ). This questionnaire was developed by researchers at Ohio State University. The LOQ gives scores on two dimensions of leadership style--Consideration and Structure.

A sample of 150 women was drawn from the 1973-74 member-ship list of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors. Women listed as vice-presidents, deans, directors, coordinators of student personnel units and assistants and associates of student personnel administrators were included in the population. A total population of 476 was identified.

Because job titles did not give an accurate account of these women, the decision to classify each one as upper-management or middle-management was determined by three questions in the Bio-graphical Questionnaire. If they answered each part of the question affirmatively they were classified as upper-management, otherwise they were considered middle-management.

A three-phase analysis was used in analyzing the results of the dissertation. A brief description of the sample was given, relation-ships between variables and leadership styles were described, and relationships between variables and level of leadership were coded.

Chi-square analysis was used to ascertain relationships between upper-management, middle-management, and both groups and selected variables. t test analyses were also used to determine any mean differences in scores on the Leadership Opinion Question-naire between the two management levels. This was done for each dimension (Consideration and Structure) of the LOQ and the two levels of management.

The data from the Biographical Questionnaire and the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire suggested that there were differences among women student personnel administrators. Eight of these observations reached statistical significance: (1) upper-management women were receiving higher salaries; (2) more middle-management student personnel officers were pursuing advanced degrees; (3) a large majority of the women who had affiliated with a feminist group were in the twenty to forty age category; (4) the majority of the women in both groups rated themselves as middle-management; (5) women who were married scored higher on the Consideration dimension of the LOQ; (6) administrators whose mothers were employed at the professional or managerial levels scored higher in the Consideration dimension of the LOQ; (7) women who were pursuing doctoral degrees scored higher on the Consideration dimension of the LOQ; and (8) oldest children and oldest female children scored higher on the Structure dimension of the LOQ.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation is the result of the cooperative effort of NAWDAC and each woman student personnel administrator who took the time to respond to the questionnaire.

To the Chairman of my doctoral committee, Dr. L. Dale Faunce, my appreciation for his kindness, cooperation, and continued support. A special thank you to Dr. A. Jack Asher for his professional guidance, and to Drs. Paul Griffeth and William Martinson for their constructive criticism and help.

To my husband and friend, Lawrence Schlack, and our son, Michael, my gratitude for their continued faith, help, and encouragement.

Marilyn Schlack

ii

INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

74-19,076

SCHLACK, Marilyn Joyce, 1936–
A COMPARISON OF PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS AND
LEADERSHIP STYLES OF UNIVERSITY UPPER-
MANAGEMENT AND MIDDLE-MANAGEMENT WOMEN STUDENT
PERSONNEL ADMINISTRATORS.

Western Michigan University, Ed.D., 1974
Education, higher

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

TABLE OF CONTENTS

iii

LIST OF TABLES

iv

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Rationale for the Study

The movement of women into administrative roles has been a slow and arduous process. As Baker (1964) stated, the lives of women have been up-rooted and redirected over the past 100 years. At first, women were accepted into the work force only to reduce labor costs. Today they constitute more than a third of the labor force. Some people are beginning to realize that women are individuals that must be viewed in terms of their motivational, intellectual, sexual and physical makeup just as are men. These factors, cited Mueller (1966), and not gender, should be the decisive determinants of career choice and opportunities. Mueller predicted that the kind of change needed would be evoked through a "massive attack" which would project a clearer understanding about the work role of well-educated women in today's society.

The history of the occupational growth of women is an example of how tradition and prejudice can deter a large group of society notwithstanding their experience, training, ability or potential. A great impetus for change came from the Commission on the

1

Status of Women which was established by President John F. Kennedy in 1961. The commission, chaired by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, had its resulting report edited by Mead and Kaplan (1965). This report recognized the need for changes in the education and counseling of females on several fronts: home, community, government, and labor.

Although recognizing that more American women are better prepared for jobs than at any other time, Alan Pifer (1972), President of the Carnegie Corporation, summarized the plight facing women. He commented that "The real problem is not simply the prevention of discrimination against women but the promotion of their fuller participation in all aspects of higher education (p. 12)." This problem, of course, is not limited to higher education. According to the 1970 report of the President's Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities, less than six percent of the nation's lawyers are women and only eight percent of the medical doctors are women. These figures are even more interesting when it is noted that women tend to do better than men on the admissions tests for both law and medical schools.

The problem, though perplexing, is not new. Margaret Sanger and Susan B. Anthony were only two of many women who fought hard to change restrictions that determined a woman's role in society. Although their efforts were important, they had little effect on the

overall status of women. Therefore, it is not surprising that in the 1960's women's liberation groups sprang up around the country. These groups have brought to light many new issues concerning today's women. They have forced society to ponder the plight of women and to discover and examine its own ignorance of the whole problem.

What is a woman's role? Is it marriage and family first? Should everything else be secondary to this role? The feminists say no. They point out that women have been forced by social pressures into the role of wife and mother with few, if any, alternatives. They further claim that because of society's preconceived ideas and practices few women have been able to break out of the subservient shell and little is known about those who have.

Research by the United States Department of Labor (1969) indicated that in 1968, women earned forty-two percent of the bachelors' degrees and first professional degrees, thirty-six percent of the masters' degrees and only thirteen percent of the doctorates awarded that year. However, degrees are of little value if women are not employed to practice their skills. In a 1960 study it was discovered that only 9.4 percent of the faculty at twenty leading universities were women and they comprised but 4.7 percent of the full professors. As might be expected, most of the women faculty members were clustered in a few fields of study: education, home

economics, nursing, and library science (Bernard, 1964). Ten years later, the United States Office of Education (1971) reported that only 8.6 percent of all _full_ professors were women.

Significantly, in the field of education where the majority of the teaching force is women, only a small minority are in administration. Of the 13,000 public school superintendents, only sixty-five are women, which is less than one-tenth of one percent (NEA, 1973). Moreover, women hold 13 percent of the doctorates in educational administration (Christian Science Monitor, 1972). Part of the problem may be that women have not pursued these posts. The literature supports the theory that a large portion of the discrepancy, however, is due to either discrimination or the lack of encouragement and counseling on the part of various agencies to help women enter administrative work.

Cynthia Fuchs Epstein (1970) wrote that "Our Best women-- those in whom society has invested most heavily, underperform, underachieve, and underproduce. We waste them and they waste themselves (p. 4)."

The picture is changing and interest is high in the role of women in our society. Questions are being asked about educational and career opportunities. To date, however, much of the research on women has focused on various personal and social pressures affecting a woman's home and college environment (Abelson, 1970;

Schmidt, 1970; Showalter, 1971; Treadwell, 1969). The few studies that have identified women who have achieved professionally have not delved into the reasons for their success. This dissertation probed into the background and administrative style of women administrators in the attempt to try and discover some reasons why they have achieved.

This investigation afforded a multiple opportunity: first, to investigate and report on leadership behavior theories which have been a source of challenge and contradiction to those in the behavioral sciences; second, to seek out and to study those women who are in leadership positions in higher education in order to ascertain whether they match or resemble leadership behaviors described in the literature; and finally, to compare leadership styles and personal characteristics of upper-management women student personnel administrators with middle-management women student personnel administrators.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was fourfold: (1) to outline the major trends in leadership behavior studies found in the professional literature, (2) to study a sample of female student personnel administrators on university campuses in the United States in order to note the leadership styles of upper-management administrators and

middle-management administrators, (3) to gather pertinent biographical data about these two groups of women, and finally (4) to compare these two groups of women to see whether there were differences in their backgrounds and behaviors.

Questions

The basic question of the dissertation was to determine which leadership behaviors, if any, were significant to each group of administrators. The study was undertaken in an effort to find answers to the following questions:

1. Do leadership styles of women student personnel administrators vary with job level?

2. Are these leadership styles consistent with the ones found in the literature?

3. Have upper-management women administrators had more training or education than those in middle-management?

4. Are women who achieve upper-management administrative posts unmarried or childless?

5. Do upper-management student personnel administrators have family backgrounds similar to middle-management administrators?

6. Are upper-management female administrators more mobile than middle-management administrators?

7. What variables do affect the responses of women student
   personnel administrators in either upper-management or
   middle-management?

> age
> professional memberships and leadership
> size of university
> publications
> feminist affiliation

The answers to these questions may provide information which
will help solve some of the complex problems faced by those who
must select and/or place women administrators.

Definition of Terms

In view of the specialized nature of the fields of leadership
and student personnel services, it seemed necessary to stipulate
certain definitions of terms frequently used in the text.

1. Student personnel was used to describe specific services
   provided to students at the junior college, college and
   university levels. These services include such things as
   housing, health, counseling, admissions, registration,
   financial aids, activities, and scholarships.

2. Leadership style was used interchangeably in the study
   with leadership behavior. Boles (1973) defined leader-
   ship style as a "consistent manner in which actions are
   performed in helping a group move toward goals acceptable

to its members (p. 3)."

3. <u>Upper-management</u> was that plateau of administration that
   requires the leader to initiate or approve operating policies;
   to develop or approve a budget; and to be responsible for
   an administrative unit.

4. <u>Middle-management</u> was the level of management that was
   not responsible for policy, budget, and/or an administrative
   unit.

Overview

Procedures for accomplishing the four purposes of the disserta-
tion involved surveying various theories on leadership behavior,
drawing a random sample of women student personnel administrators
at the university level, reporting the findings, and criticizing the
findings in light of the literature.

Survey of Various Theories on Leadership Behavior

Literally hundreds of studies have been done and a great deal
written about theories of leadership. Major developments were
traced from a wide variety of sources. As a result, four basic
elements of leadership theory have been identified. They are (1)
the leader; (2) the follower; (3) the situation; and (4) the task.

For the purposes of this study, the leader was the main focus
of concern. Gibb (1969) has pointed out that some writers have

distinguished between "headman" and "leader" by defining the leader as someone who directs the group through mutual support and cooperation; the "headman," on the other hand, directs solely on the strength of his position. In this study, the leader was defined as an individual who directs and coordinates the group toward goals. The concern of the study was to determine the leader's "resources relevant to goal attainment (Hollander and Julian, 1964)."

Significant research about women in leadership roles is limited. When such data is available, it is not usually comprehensive. Much of the research done on women in administrative posts is found in recent doctoral studies. However, these dissertations are a starting point for further research. For this study, the literature on women was reviewed in four areas: (1) characteristics of women administrators; (2) female administrators in higher education; (3) women student personnel administrators; and (4) women business executives.

Development of Sample of Women Student Personnel Administrators at the University Level

A probability sample of women administrators in student personnel services at the university level was developed and one hundred and fifty women were sent questionnaires. The population of women chosen for sampling was composed of those whose job titles were vice-president, dean, coordinator or director of student personnel services, and the assistants and associates to

student personnel administrators at the university level. These administrators were drawn at random from the 1973 membership list of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors. The population consisted of 476 women student personnel administrators.

Because job titles did not give an accurate job account of these women, the decision to classify each one as either upper-management or middle-management administrators was determined by three questions. (See question number 14 in Appendix A) These questions were:

1. Are you responsible for the operation of:

    (a) one departmental or organizational unit?

    (b) more than one departmental or organizational unit?

2. Are you responsible for the development and/or approval of budget(s) of:

    (a) your own unit?

    (b) more than one unit?

3. Do you initiate and/or approve operating policies for:

    (a) one unit?

    (b) more than your own?

If all three of these questions were answered in the affirmative, the administrator was classified as upper-management. If not, then the administrator was classified as middle-management.

Two questionnaires were sent to each group of women. The Biographical Questionnaire was used to determine personal characteristics that might be unique to either group. The Ohio State University's Leadership Opinion Questionnaire was used to measure the leadership styles of the women.

Report of the Findings

After surveying the one hundred and fifty women student personnel administrators, their leadership and personal characteristics were summarized and compared. This was the crux of the investigation. A broad profile of these women was obtained. From their data came observations concerning leadership behavior and personal characteristics of upper-management and middle-management women student personnel administrators at the university level.

Criticism of the Findings in the Light of Professional Writings

Data gathered from the questionnaires were compared with the findings in the writings of researchers in the leadership field. If there were discrepancies between earlier research findings and this study, these discrepancies were pointed out and described. Because it seemed logical to expect women administrators to be doing what had been described in other administrative studies, it was worthwhile to discover in what respects they were or were not similar in personal characteristics and leadership behaviors, and to

speculate on reasons.

The dissertation was organized around these major procedures. In the next chapter, the major trends in leadership theory are reviewed as are the findings of related research on women. Chapter III is a discussion of the sampling procedures, Chapter IV presents a summarization of the findings, and in the final chapter the summary and recommendations are given.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

As noted in Chapter I, the literature on leadership theory is vast. However, studies specifically involving women in leadership roles is limited. Since the literature on women student personnel administrators is so restricted, it was necessary to draw from a variety of areas so that a better understanding of the problem could be developed.

The literature is filled with a variety of research and commentary about various leadership theories. Books, journals, and monographs provide a broad and in-depth overview of leadership theory. Since the early 1960s and more especially the early 1970s, references to studies done specifically about women in administrative roles have become more common. In spite of this surge of new research on women, in-depth information about women managers is still meager. Much of the commentary has focused on personal and social pressures affecting a woman's environment. Only a small part of the literature is directed toward a better understanding of women in leadership roles.

Today, with opportunities opening for women in managerial

13

roles, very little is known about how to select or place able women in administrative positions. Definitive materials, research results, and recommendations are needed for better selection and placement of women in administration.

The literature review consists of two general categories pertinent to an understanding of the thesis. The first category is a brief review of the development of leadership theories. It is apparent that leadership theories developed out of three main areas: the traits approach, the situational approach, and the leadership style approach. The second category deals primarily with women administrators. The literature on women is reviewed in four areas: administrators in higher education, business executives, student personnel administrators and personal characteristics of women in administration.

Leadership Theories

A problem plaguing schools of education for many years has been the need for a method or methods to better select and place administrators. The literature is filled with a variety of leadership theories on the selection of administrators for positions at all levels. And yet, notwithstanding a large body of research data, leadership itself is a hazy and perplexing phenomenon (Bennis, 1959). There is little conclusive support for any one process of

selecting administrators or placing them.

The Trait Approach

A look at the history of leadership research reveals one of the serious difficulties in leadership theory. The emphasis in this research has shifted from simple explanations of observable behavior to examinations of complex relationships. For example, early research tried to delineate specific traits of leaders which would distinguish them from others. This line of investigation seemed plausible as these personal qualities or traits could be isolated, modified, and tested. Personal histories and various screening devices could be developed to select persons with appropriate traits for leadership positions. However, in over one hundred and six leadership studies, Lippitt (1955) found that only five percent of the traits appeared in four or more of the studies. Jenkins (1947) reviewed the literature dealing with personality traits through World War II and concluded that no single trait or characteristic could be found that would distinguish a leader from any other member of a group. Stogdill's (1948) study of leadership traits found that such traits were influenced by the situation and the group.

As a result of Stogdill's study (and others like his), there have been further studies that explore the relationship between personality and leadership. These subsequent studies supported

the idea that personality factors do contribute to the emergence and continuance of the leader (Bass 1960; Borgatta, et al., 1954; and Hollander and Julian, 1964). However, the specific factors were still not determined.

Lane and others (1966) offered an explanation for the fact that researchers have not been able to discover specific leadership traits that are possessed by all leaders. These researchers argue that because on-going organizations are not amenable to simulation, and because of the history, reward structures, conflicts, and changing memberships within these organizations, accurate studies of an individual's leadership traits are very nearly impossible to accomplish.

Yet another problem which complicates such leadership studies is that the term "leader" has a plethora of definitions. A few selected definitions are reported here to reflect this range.

The leader is one who succeeds in getting others to follow him (Cowley, 1928, p. 154).

Leadership is the process of influencing group activities toward goal setting and goal achievement (Stogdill, 1948, p. 35).

Leadership is the process of influencing thoughts, behaviors, and feelings of others in pursuit of common goals (Cummings, 1971, p. 184).

Leadership is a process in which an individual takes initiative to assist a group to move toward production goals that are acceptable to maintain the group, and to dispose of those needs of individuals within the group that impelled them to join (Boles, 1973, p. 3).

Obviously a dilemma exists when so many definitions are available. Readers cannot be certain how the various research findings are differentiated by levels and kinds of leadership or whether these findings are even comparable. The term "leadership" may be used in too broad a sense to establish a criterion for leadership.

The methods used to study leaders are also in doubt. A basic problem is the identification of a leader to be studied. Cowley (1928) pinpointed this difficulty early in the history of leadership theory research. His thought was that a person cannot be studied as a leader just because he is in a leadership position. Cowley pointed out that some individuals do function as leaders while others serve only as head men. He later studied prison inmates, military units, and university undergraduates and concluded that the leaders in each of these groups had traits which set them apart from those around them. None of these leaders, however, had traits in common. From these findings Cowley concluded that leadership must be studied in reference to the situation in which the leader functions. In an important review of the literature, which supports Cowley's idea, Mann (1959) concluded that a leader's abilities, aptitudes, and background tended to be related to those goals set by the group.

The Situational Approach

From Mann's conclusions, the situational approach was developed and refined. The situational approach meant that researchers would be more concerned with the situation in which the leader functioned and less concerned with the leader himself. Carter and Nixon (1949) found that when leadership was studied in relationship to the situation, the leader's tasks fell into three distinct families. These task families varied from one to another but within any one family they were rather stable and appeared to be determined by the leader's personality.

Several other examples from the research make the situational approach even clearer. In 1948, Bavelas, who developed a paradigm for communication studies, placed small groups around a table. The subjects were given various problems to solve but were allowed to communicate only in limited ways. It was found that those individuals seated in the center of the group tended to be the decision makers.

Similarly, Hare, Borgetta and Bales (1955) discovered that persons high on the dominance scale chose central positions in the group. Stenzor (1950), in analyzing the interaction process of groups seated at tables, also found that seating arrangements helped to determine leadership. Jennings (1950) conducted a study in a girls' school which showed that group-chosen leaders tended

to be seen as the group spokesmen. And finally, in a series of studies done by Bavelas, Hostorf, Gross and Kite (1965), several experiments were designed to reward or penalize group members for speaking during group discussions. To no one's surprise, individuals who were rewarded for speaking did speak more than those who were not rewarded. What was interesting in these results was that regardless of the significance of their contribution, those who spoke the most were seen more often by the group as leaders.

Jaynes (1956) summed up the situational approach and its problems when he said:

> There is a school of theory in the Social Sciences which maintains that leadership is situationally determined. It is apparent that the "situation" may be composed of a great variety of variables. In order to subject the situational hypothesis to an experimental test, it is necessary to specify and measure those aspects of the situation which may be thought to have a bearing on leadership. The type of position which the leader occupies, and the type of organization in which he functions, may be regarded as situational factors which might affect his performance (p. 16).

The difficulty in using the situational approach in studying leaders, therefore, is that the situation becomes the determinant of successful leadership behavior. This approach calls for an assessment of the situation in order that a certain type of person can be identified to serve as leader.

The Leadership Styles Approach

The realization that the situation is a determinant of leadership behavior brought researchers back to the study of the leader himself. Even though any attempt to discuss behavioral characteristics of effective leaders may be doomed from the start, evidence in the literature indicates that there are still honest efforts being made to determine what leaders do that others do not do. Hemphill (1949) argues that there are certain behaviors leaders must have which are necessary to fill various situations. He says:

> From the situational viewpoint it would seem futile to search for a leadership trait which would distinguish among individuals likely to be good or bad leaders in all situations. However, this would not imply that a leader could not be trained to be effective in a wide range of situations if he knew the leadership roles required of an individual in adapting to various situations (p. 101).

Leaders do a great variety of tasks and any attempt to differentiate the important behaviors may be impossible. It seems clear, however, that leaders behave differently from other group members and as a result, the delineation of behavioral characteristics of effective leaders continues. Hemphill (1949) stressed that it would be futile to search for a leadership trait which would distinguish individuals likely to be good or bad leaders in all situations. But he went on to say that this would not imply that a leader could not be trained to be effective in a wide range of situations if he knew the leadership roles required in adapting to various situations.

A conceptual analysis of leadership designed by Hemphill (1961) classified three groups of leadership acts. They are: (1) <u>attempted</u> leadership acts, which are any attempts to influence the behavior of others in order to achieve a common goal; (2) <u>successful</u> leadership acts, which result in changing the behaviors of the other group members; and (3) <u>effective</u> leadership acts, which lead to the achievement of desired goals.

It seems, then, that when Hemphill writes of leadership roles required of an individual, he is really saying that certain behavioral characteristics are required to fill such roles. Campbell (1956), in <u>Leadership and Its Effects Upon the Group</u>, supports this position for he remarks that:

> . . . where training and selection procedures are utilized, where the notion of leadership skills or human-relations skills appear, the notion is still held that some of the variance in group effectiveness is a function of stable aspects of the behavior of persons in key positions. This hypothesis is implicitly retained in most of the leadership studies undertaken by psychologists . . . . (p. 2)

Stogdill, <u>et al.</u> (1956) further suggested that there are four variables which could be used to analyze the differences in leader behavior. They are: (1) cultural and environmental variables; (2) differences between individuals; (3) differences between jobs; and (4) differences between organizations.

If Stogdill's approach is accepted, some consideration must be given to each of these variables. For example, in considering

the difference between jobs and organizations, Stogdill (1956) states that the " . . . results of this study suggest that variables in performance in the sample studied are more closely related to the type of positions which an officer occupies than to the type of organization in which his position is located.(p. 30)".

A leader's behavioral characteristics or tendencies, then, are a reflection of the individual's traits. Many theorists began to develop the idea that any investigation of leaders should deal with the leader's behavior or style. The research shows that styles in leadership are numerous. Some leaders are considerate, some demanding, others make all the decisions, others are democratic and some have a combination of styles. Fiedler (1967) defines these differences in leadership styles. By leadership style, Fiedler is referring to certain behaviors that characterize the leader's method of interacting with those in subordinate positions.

One of the earliest studies of leadership styles was done by Lewin, Lippit and White (1939). They observed the behavior of four similar groups of ten-year-old boys.

Records were kept of each group's behavior. The boys were observed, analyzed, recorded and filmed. The results showed definite patterns of leadership styles of interaction. These styles were labeled autocratic, democratic or laissez faire. For example, in the autocratic group there was more hostility, aggression

and scapegoating among the members than in the democratic group. The democratic and laissez faire leaders were better liked than the autocratic leader by the other members.

Lewin's et al. findings have been replicated many times in various ways. In one study, several classes were asked to rank presidential candidates in order of preference (Preston and Heintz, 1949). The class was then divided into groups and asked again to rank candidates, this time working as groups. Leaders were assigned to each of these groups and they were told to be either a participatory or a supervisory leader. The participatory leader, who was considerate and encouraging to the group members, was given half an hour to complete the task. The supervisory leaders were instructed not to participate in the discussion and to be responsible only for finishing within the allotted time. The results showed the participatory leader to be more effective.

In a study done by Carter (1953), three main factors of leader behavior were identified. They were:

Factor I: Group Goal Facilitation. Efficiency, cooperation, insight and supportiveness were examples of behavior which were seen as facilitators in helping the group solve the task.

Factor II: Individual Performance. The individual stood out in the group. Such behavior as agressiveness, self-confidence, and initiative allowed an individual to be recognized by the rest of the

group.

Factor III: Group Sociability. The individual was well-liked, extroverted, and cooperative in the group.

One of the most comprehensive and lengthy studies on leadership behavior has been developed and conducted at Ohio State University. In 1950, Hemphill obtained ratings of leader behavior on over 1,000 items. The instrument has been reworked and refined over the years. Through a process of factor analysis, two major dimensions of leadership behavior emerged--the first, consideration and the second, initiation structures. These two dimensions were defined as follows by Halpin (1959):

> CONSIDERATION refers to behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect, and warmth in the relationship between the leader and members of the group.

> INITIATING STRUCTURE refers to the leader's behavior in delineating the relationship between himself and the members of his group, and in endeavoring to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting the job done (p. 2).

> The research has shown that the effective leader will score

high on both dimensions (Fleishman, et al., 1955; Halpin, 1955; Ramseyer, et al., 1955). Fleishman, et al. (1955), summarized the research when they wrote:

> The behavior of a leader reflects (1) his regard for others and (2) his efforts to promote action. Consideration of others without regard to getting on with the task at hand produces excellent social relations but does not necessarily prove to be productive. On the other hand, driving directly

toward the accomplishment of a goal without due consideration of others may create conditions which can put the administrator out of his job (p. 5).

The questionnaire used by the Ohio State research team has been refined over the years and as a result another scale was developed for leaders in a formal organization to determine leadership style. The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire, which was used in this study, is the latest instrument in the questionnaire's development. The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire is described in Chapter III.

Obviously there are certain cautions that must be considered when gathering descriptions of leaders' behaviors. Hemphill (1950) points out that leaders who are liked tend to be described as more considerate than those who are not liked. Leadership popularity can skew any research results. The leadership field, though, will continue to be complex and fascinating to behavioral scientists as new data emerges.

Women in Administration

From the vast body of research on leadership, this dissertation focused closely on the leadership style of women student personnel administrators. Because the background information in this area is less substantial in depth and breadth than that found in the leadership fields, a variety of resources were used.

A number of studies have been conducted in recent years which, in common with the general aims of this dissertation, have attempted to ascertain information about women in administrative positions. However, none have had the same specific aim of this study: the comparison of leadership styles of upper-management women student personnel administrators with women student personnel administrators at the middle-management level in American universities. Although these other studies differ from this dissertation in specific aim and approach, many were related to the general purpose of the study; thus their findings were pertinent and of interest.

Women Administrators and Higher Education

The struggle to enable women to enter higher education has been a long and difficult process. In colonial times, girls were not included in formal schooling. They were considered intellectually inferior and too weak to maintain the rigors of academic life (Newcomer, 1959). All they needed to know could be provided in the home. In the eighteenth century, however, teaching in the dame schools was considered acceptable but only for women who needed the money. These early schools emphasized female skills: manners, sewing, embroidery, music, and those accomplishments regarded as feminine. Women finally gained entrance into publicly supported institutions in the nineteenth century in supervisory roles.

The supervisor was the first administrative position for women in higher education. Female students were guided by a "Lady Principal" (Lloyd-Jones, Smith, 1938). The "Lady Principal" was responsible for correcting the girls' habits, helping to mold their character, supervising their social life, and for all discipline (Lee, 1959).

Although the establishment of the position of "Lady Principal" in the nineteenth century was the first attempt to place women in administrative functions, additional roles were not as successful. Indicative of this is the record of women in higher education. In 1930, women comprised forty-seven percent of the undergraduate population and twenty-eight percent of the students at the doctoral level. In 1968, women made up forty-three percent of those graduating from undergraduate programs and only 12.6 percent of those receiving doctorates (Murray, 1971).

Murray (1971) noted, too, that witnesses testifying before the United States House of Representatives' Committee on Education and Labor attributed this decline of women at the college and university level first to "the reality and fear of higher admission standards;" second, to the well known fact that women are frequently channelled into feminine related fields; and third, to documented instances of professors and admissions offices discouraging academic advancement for women.

Elizabeth L. Cless (1968) stated that:

> Higher education in the United States was designed exclusively
> for the white, upper- or middle-class male. Its procedures,
> its rigid uninterrupted timetable, and its cost all but pro-
> hibits its use by women (p. 618).

Recently two women's rights organizations have charged more
than forty colleges and universities with discriminatory practices
against women. These women cited such incidents as undergraduate
and graduate quotas for women; lack of financial help at the graduate
level; and discrimination in hiring, promotions, and salary for
women faculty (Gruchow, 1970).

As a result of such discrimination, the majority of professional
women are found in femininely acceptable fields. Cohen (1971)
points out that "Many women go into teaching, but few are found at
the college or university level, and fewer still in the professional
ranks (p. 4)."

McGannon (1972) stated the problem even more succinctly
when he said:

> The principal problem with women in administration and the
> principal fact regarding women in administration is that
> there aren't any women in administration--hardly any to
> speak of, that is (p. 1).

Not only are there few women in the administrative ranks, but
their numbers have been decreasing. Carroll (1972) gives one
rationale for such a decline.

> There was a time when women were assured at least one
> representative in the top layer of administration in the office

of Dean of Women (again an area of responsibility dealing only with women). Today, however, most universities have abolished this position and created a new one--Dean of Students. Regrettably--the later post is usually held by a man and women appear further down the administrative ladder as associate or assistant deans (p. 214).

Taylor (1963), citing a study done by Hemphill, Griffith, and Fredrickson supporting the idea that there is no statistically significant academic differences between the sexes, emphasizes that women administrators are becoming extinct.

Carroll (1973) asked the question: "Why are there so few women administrators in higher education?" Studies noted in the literature suggest that (1) women do not seek administrative positions; (2) males who are leaving a position do not support women for such offices; and (3) in selecting new administrators, those who make such appointments do not look for a woman. How does the literature support these conclusions?

Based on a survey of women in educational leadership, Burns (1964) noted that the decline will continue in the assignment of women to leadership positions unless women themselves are motivated to assume responsibility associated with leadership assignments. Although this study was done at the K-12 public school level, it seems indicative of women at all levels.

Other pertinent points that indicate why women do not seek top administrative posts were evident in the literature. First, many

women do not perceive themselves as able to be effective adminis-
trators; and second, they are convinced that they have little chance
to be selected for administrative posts (Carroll, 1972).

The literature also supports the point that men do not recom-
mend women for responsible positions. Edwin C. Lewis (1961)
found that there is a real resistance to women by men. Many men
do not want to work for a woman and therefore do not support their
promotion. Stevenson (1973) suggested also that women do not
always support one another. She recommended that in order for
women to move up the administrative ladder, they must be more
helpful to each other professionally. Finally, several studies noted
that women lacked sponsorship (Loring and Wells, 1972; Stevenson,
1973). As in the business world, potential women administrators
in higher education need a person who will give them an informal
education in management, an opportunity to interact effectively
(especially with male workers), and added personal support in order
to help them clarify their professional goals. The importance of
this kind of support is illustrated by the following:

> . . . at one midwestern state university . . . the dean of
> women was nationally known and widely respected. The dean
> of students, who became her immediate supervisor, had no
> standing in the community and not much locally, but he was
> the same sex as the all male administration of the university,
> which had been coeducational since . . . 1869. (Graham,
> 1970, p. 1285).

Why then don't those who make new administrative appointments

select women? Dr. Rita Cooley of New York University summarizes
the answer neatly.

> . . . the universities tend to think automatically in terms of
> men when filling a new position. In a sense it is like racism.
> This discrimination exists at an unconscious level. There
> is no opportunity for women in administration (Cunningham,
> 1970, p. 60).

Whether this trend can be changed is a real concern of today's
women. The literature is not too encouraging. As a matter of fact,
the number of women in administrative positions at the college and
university levels was lower in the mid 1960s than it was twenty-five
years ago (WEAL, 1972).

Arter (1972), in her dissertation, was concerned with women
administrators in top-level positions in state universities and land-
grant colleges. She obtained her data about women administrators
from presidents, vice-presidents or other chief officers as well as
the top women administrators of 118 institutions. She found that
sixty percent of the institutions had no top level women administra-
tors, twenty-one percent had one, and nineteen percent had two.
Thirty-three percent had not even considered a woman candidate
and twenty-eight percent had recently appointed one to three women
for various openings.

Sander (1972) facetiously but succinctly sums up the dilemma
when she says:

> . . . right now, the best way for a woman to become a
> college president is to get herself to a nunnery. Were it

not for the Catholic Sisters the number of women college presidents would be far less than the number of whooping cranes (p. 1).

Against this bleak background some faint signs of change are emerging. In a report done by the National Education Association (1965), several suggestions were made in an effort to reverse the trend of "women's tapering role" in educational administration. The report lists the following suggestions: curricula which make allowances for the rapid advancement of talented women; increased educational subsidies for women; counseling girls and women to view their life span in its entirety; and encouraging women in education to employ their initiative and leadership.

Carroll (1972) makes several suggestions for both men and women to help reverse the dismal trend. She feels that perhaps the most important step is for women to apply for administrative positions. Carroll makes the point that in order to achieve executive positions, women must make their talents known. She cautions, however, that women must be prepared to make the commitment an administrative post requires prior to the time she is selected. Carroll points out, too, that women must be encouraged to work with and to help other women in their career developments. And finally, she urges all women to decline any committee or department assignments that perpetuate a stereotyped role for women.

Men in responsible positions who are not restricted by the

stereotyped concept of "women" can do a great deal to help increase the number of women administrators, says Carroll (1972). She points out that change cannot occur unless there is a strong commitment from males who wield the power. She says that such a commitment would involve women in positions of responsibility, adjust salaries to make them comparable to a male's in the same job, and include informal training "to help women get the 'big' picture" (Carroll, 1972, p. 217).

Women Business Executives

Studies done in fields other than education point out that women in other areas are faced with similar roadblocks. Their numbers are small, their chances for advancement limited, and colleague support miniscule. Truman says that "Women today account for less than four percent of the lawyers, about seven percent of the physicians, a tiny fraction of professors, and a comparably small proportion of corporate executives (1972)."

The question that immediately comes to mind is what is special about the small minority of women who have made it in the executive world? Several research studies have been written on female executives. A study by Stafford (1961) attempted to look at a group of eminent women in the fields of dentistry, law, medicine, educational and nursing administration. The object was to see whether

there were any similarities or differences in the backgrounds of these women which motivated them toward professional achievement. Interviews and questionnaires were used to obtain data. She found that there were no significant differences among motivating factors of professional women for their field of choice. However, parental encouragement toward education was the motivating factor most often cited.

In another study, twenty-seven pairs of male and female executives were matched on several points: organizational level; corporation size; type of business; and job similarity. These data were used to compare men and women who were top managerial material. The study tried to determine factors that might cause female executives to seek and maintain executive positions. It was found that the women were older than the men, had less education, and were employed in smaller firms. The men had higher salaries than the women in local firms although no salary difference was noted in national companies. Both groups agreed that men resisted working for a woman and that success was more easily achieved by men (Doll, 1965).

In an intensive study covering a period of two and one-half years, Hennig (1971) reviewed the career development of women executives. She found that the majority of these women executives stayed with their companies most of their careers. Hennig's

findings tend to support the theory that women are not as mobile as men.

In a nationwide study, a sample of working men and women was probed about their careers. At first the researchers thought that women were less concerned about getting ahead. For example, only forty-eight percent of the women wanted to be promoted, compared with sixty-four percent of the men. Upon closer observation, however, it was learned that while women might desire a promotion they did not really expect one. Therefore, in order " . . . to avoid frustration, women, like men in the same situation, scale down their ambitions (Crowley, et al., 1973, p. 96). "

Only three percent of existing managerial positions are held by women. Of this three percent most positions are found in the state or federal governments (Basil, 1972). Basil also found that smaller firms had no women in management positions. The larger the firm the more likely were women to be in executive positions.

How did women who achieved executive positions get there? Throughout the literature it is cited that "sponsorship" was one of the most important reasons for the success of executive women. Without it, women are left out of the informal system through which most men advance (Loring and Wells, 1972).

Hennig (1971) found a significant similarity in the background of successful women executives. She cited that "upon entering the

business world, they quickly became affiliated with a particular young executive with whom they worked throughout most of their career (p. 10). "

The same evidence was seen in other studies. Cussler (1958) did an in-depth field study of fifty-five women executives from the eastern seaboard. Her objective was to find the real sentiments of this small group of executive women and of those who worked with them. One of her conclusions was that in order for these women to succeed they were coached and counseled. These coaches and counselors, who were usually men, took the woman executive under their wing early in her career, prepared her for responsibility, and then at the critical time suggested her for an important job.

Such support does not happen to many women. As a matter of fact, in a survey of male executives, a large number admitted that they were to blame to a great degree for the fact that there were so few women in executive positions (Management Methods, 1957).

Turner (1964) concluded that the prospect for women executives is not promising for the future. Women at all levels of the business world are often uninformed or misinformed regarding the probability of jobs and opportunities open to them.

Women in Student Personnel Administration

There appears to be some evidence that women student per-sonnel administrators make up the largest group of women

administrators in post-secondary education. This should come as no surprise when it is analyzed. One author stated in 1972 that ". . . there are twenty-one women identified as administrators . . . " (Matfield, 1972, p. 3) in the Ivy League schools. Most of these administrators work directly with students. This suggests to Matfield that working directly with students may be considered less prestigious and, as a result, more appropriate for women. For example, she points out that three of the nine Ivy League schools recently appointed women as Dean of Students or Dean of Student Affairs. These three women were the only women of the forty-one who were considered for administrative officers and who did not have prefixed titles (Matfield, 1972).

Throughout the literature there is evidence that women administrators in student personnel services face the same kind of discrimination as women in other professions. For example, deans of women, although they are identified as administrators, often function simply as counselors (Reeves and Arbuckle, 1963).

Cheatham (1964) and Hester (1971) found in their research in the field of student personnel that women administrators tend to be older than men in comparable jobs, and these women tend to have longer tenure than men. Nevertheless, men held two-thirds of the student personnel positions and women the other third (Ferrari, 1972).

Longer tenure, however, seems to have little effect on the advancement of women in student personnel work. In fact, just the opposite seems true. In a study of mobility, Sherburne (1968) found that males tended to move upward more quickly than females within any given level of a student personnel organization even if females were as well or better qualified for upward mobility. He concluded that the fastest way to the top of a student personnel organization in Big Ten universities was not through promotion from within the organization but rather the ability to move from one institution to another. Sherburne felt that variables not included in his study may have been operating. These variables, he felt, apparently prevented the promotion of female student personnel administrators. Some of these factors included desire for promotion on the part of this group of women, attitudes of male administrators toward their female colleagues and the influence on female mobility as a result of the organizational structure. These variables are the same as those considered by Carroll (1972) and Cowley, et al. (1972), as reported earlier.

There are few studies which deal specifically with women student personnel administrators. In an earlier work, Spencer (1951) traced the role of deans of women from 1936 to 1947. She then compared her findings with earlier studies done in this area. From her findings she recommended that women deans must be aware of the

community, have an understanding of future development in the field, be able to communicate with other administrators and be able to gain professional respect from colleagues. McBee (1961), on the other hand, recommended that women administrators in student personnel should be generalists rather than specialists and should be trained in the art of counseling.

The training and qualifications of women student personnel administrators has interested other researchers too. Cabotoje (1963) did a comparative study of women deans in the United States and the Philippines. She found that the qualifications of women in both countries' institutions of higher education were nearly identical.

Koenig (1964) also did a study of the training and preparation of women in student personnel administration. She concluded that there were real differences between the professionally prepared student personnel administrator and those who were trained through on-the-job experiences. Koenig felt this difference was most notable in their perception of the difference between the real and ideal functions of the position. The professionally prepared deans of women were found to assume greater responsibility for research, budgets, community involvement, in-service training of staff, and institutional committee work than those who trained experientally.

Several studies have been done on the personal character-istics of women in student personnel administration. Not too long

ago the requisite characteristics for becoming Dean of Women was to be " . . . a kindly woman with little academic training but who had been a wife and mother . . ."(McVey and Hughes, 1952).

As early as 1915, Matthews described these same kinds of characteristics as being sought by colleges and universities. She pointed out the limited role these women administrators were expected to play.

> The position itself is often but that of an apothesized chaperon; it varies from the place of an administrative officer, on a par in importance and dignity with deans of the various colleges which make up the whole university, to the mere presence in a community of gracious and charming women who "love girls" (p. 20).

More recently women deans have been cautioned to " . . . cultivate a keen awareness of the changing role of women and the trends which point to even greater change in the future (Adams, 1962, p. 23). "

In her advice to new deans, Stroud (1967) makes her recommendations even more explicit. For her a woman dean needs to be an academically competent person who is supportive of the intellectual "mission and ideals of her institution (p. 95)". This is a far cry from "Charming women who 'love girls'. "

Berry and Fitzgerald (1971) did a survey of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors. (The name of this organization has since been changed to the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors.) From a total of 1,203

respondents, they classified 310 different job titles for women student personnel workers. Of the total population, forty-one percent considered their jobs to be on the executive level and forty-one percent on the managerial level. Eighty-nine percent of these women reported that administrative tasks took up at least one-twelfth of their time. Advising others was considered their prime responsibility by ninety-four percent of the respondees. Fourteen percent of the women held doctorates and seventy-four percent had earned the MA degree. Supporting conclusions from other studies, Berry and Fitzgerald reported that forty-six percent of the responding membership was over forty-five years old, while twenty-five percent were under thirty years old. Only fifteen percent of this select group were in administrative student personnel positions with no one between them and the top administrator. The remainder had at least one to four persons intervening. These authors concluded that fewer were in positions that allowed them to be budgetary heads or members of key-decision making units.

In her study of women administrators in Big Ten universities, much of Stevenson's (1972) results are similar to that gathered by Berry and Fitzgerald. For example, the greatest number of women at the higher levels of administration were in the forty-five to fifty-four-year-old age bracket. Those fifty-five and older were the smallest group but it was this group that had the greatest job

diversity and the highest percentage of doctorates. Further statistics on the group of highest ranking women administrators indicate that they were forty-five to fifty-four years old; seventy-nine percent held a doctorate and the rest held a masters degree; eighty-four percent were working in the field in which their degree was granted; eighty-nine percent had held previous administrative positions and of these, eighty-four percent moved up within the institutions for which they presently worked.

Characteristics of Women Administrators

Several other studies have been done in an attempt to gain an understanding of successful women in executive positions. Although these studies are not specifically about women in student personnel administration, it would seem that parallels might well be drawn.

In an effort to determine career patterns of women administrators in higher education, Gardner (1966) sent questionnaires to women administrators in Illinois. These women were asked questions concerning their biographical, educational, and professional backgrounds which were considered influential in their career patterns. Some of Gardner's conclusions were: single women attained administrative posts more easily than married women; at least a master's degree was necessary for an administrative post; the administrator's career usually began with either office work or

teaching; these women tended to become administrators between the ages of twenty-five and thirty-five; however, some became administrators as young as twenty or after fifty; personal characteristics listed as needed were an ability to understand people, an ability to organize, and a willingness to accept responsibility. Gardner found that this group of women reached their status on their own initiative and not with the help of a sponsor.

Several researchers have found that successful people are often firstborn or only children. This finding holds true for successful women. Schorter (1965) holds that firstborn children tend to be anxious and therefore have stronger affiliative tendencies. As a result they want to be with people and seek jobs that satisfy this need.

In her extensive research on the woman executive, Hennig (1971) bore out the fact that the successful woman executive tends to be a firstborn. As a matter of fact, all fifty of the women she studied (twenty-five were top level executives and twenty-five were in middle-management positions) were either the only child or the firstborn in an all-girl family.

Hennig concluded that the top-management women had been treated not as a hoped for son but in the same way a firstborn son might have been treated. These women were encouraged to excel and achieve in competitive situations. None of them were

conditioned to accept traditional female roles. Nevertheless, all of them always had their femininity acknowledged.

The middle-management women, on the other hand, had been treated as the son for which the family had wished. They were tomboys who lacked female orientation. Hennig feels that this is one of the real keys to the success of top-level women executives: she accepts herself as a woman.

Many studies ascertained that successful women had close relationships with their father (Hennig, 1971; Macaby, 1963). Career patterns of successful women were found to be influenced also by mothers. Whether or not the mother worked and how the mother felt working exerts a strong influence on a young woman's career pattern (Fogarty, et al., 1971).

Cross (1968) found that women who enter college are likely to come from higher socio-economic homes. She concluded, too, that both parents of these women were better educated than those of college men.

In 1970, Bachtold and Werner published the results of their study entitled "Personality Profiles of Gifted Women." They found that:

> . . . role conflicts imposed on these women psychologists
> by societal expectations which leave academic women
> unsure of themselves in spite of, or rather, because of
> their outstanding capacity, drive, and achievements. It
> may be indicative of the price they had to pay for being

"different" in a society that has conflicting expectations of what it means to be a woman, a professor and an academician (p. 243).

One of the interesting outcomes of this study was that those women born before 1910 were found to be like men in their feelings of adequacy. Those born after 1925, however, showed significantly less self-confidence.

Bird (1968) sums up this dilemma by stating that:

The price of occupational success is made so high for women that barring exceptional luck only the unusually talented or frankly neurotic can afford to succeed (p. xiii).

Summary

A variety of sources were examined in order to produce a comprehensive summary of leadership theories and a comprehensive survey of leadership studies of professional women.

The main thrust of the literature was that leadership theories have emerged from simple explanations of observable behavior to sophisticated analyses of complex relationships. For example, early research tried to delineate specific traits of leaders which would distinguish them from others. When the findings from trait research could not be adequately supported, behavioralists moved to the situational approach. The situational approach concluded that a leader's abilities, aptitudes, and background tended to be related to goals set by the group. However, it soon became evident to some

theorists that the situation can become the determinant of successful leadership behavior. Obviously, this calls for an assessment of the situation in order that a certain type of person can be identified as leader.

The need for such an assessment brought researchers back to the study of the leader himself. As a result, a leader's behavior was measured so that it characterized the leader's method of interacting with subordinates.

In tracing the past developments of women professionals and, more particularly, women student personnel administrators, it was found that little attention has been given the highly trained and educated woman.

Despite some impressive gains, the overall employment picture for professional women has declined. The literature has explained such a decline in several ways: occupational sex-typing of certain professions, sex-typed career choice counseling, lack of career commitments, sex discrimination, and female career disruptions.

There are few studies which deal specifically with women student personnel officers as administrators. Some studies, however, have looked at the personal characteristics of women in student personnel administration. Female student personnel officers tend to be older and less mobile than their male

counterparts. Few women are in top-level student personnel positions.

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Research Questions

The principal goal of this research effort was to discover and report differences in personal characteristics and leadership styles between upper-management and middle-management women administrators in student personnel services. The data were gathered from a randomly selected group of women student personnel administrators by use of a biographical questionnaire and the Ohio State University's Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ). The information was gathered, reported and compared as it related to and answered the following questions.

1. Do leadership styles of women student personnel administration vary with job level?

2. Are these leadership styles consistent with the ones found in the literature?

3. Have upper-management women administrators had more training or education?

4. Are women who achieve upper-management administrative posts unmarried or childless?

48

5. Do upper-management student personnel administrators have family backgrounds similar to middle-management administrators?

6. Are upper-management female administrators more mobile than middle-management administrators?

7. What variables do affect the responses of women student personnel administrators in either upper-management or middle-management?

> age
> size of the university
> professional memberships and leadership
> publications
> feminist affiliation

These research questions were designed to reveal information about the respondents, their jobs and the field of student personnel administration.

Population and Sample

In order to obtain the most complete information concerning women student personnel administrators at the university level, a research population was drawn from the 1973-74 membership list of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors (NAWDAC). Women listed as vice-presidents, deans, directors, coordinators of student personnel units and assistants and associates of student personnel administrators were included

in the population. This allowed for some similarity in job situations. A total population of 476 was identified.

The next step was to select a sample of 150 women from this list of student personnel administrators. "Sampling is taking any portion of a population, or universe, as representative of that population or universe" (Kerlinger, 1964). The method of randomly selecting a sample from the population allows each person in the population an equal chance of being chosen. At the outset, the aim of this study was to develop a sample of women student personnel administrators in upper-management and middle-management positions which would yield results assumed representative of women student personnel administrators throughout the country. One factor, that of size, prevented construction of a nation-wide sample which would include all institutions of higher education. Instead, a sample was constructed which would be representative of the university level only.

Criteria for Sample Selection

The sampling of women chosen for this study was controlled by employing specific criteria in the selection stage. Each person to be included in this study had to be:

1. an administrator at a university rather than a college or community college;

2. responsible for some area of student personnel services;

3. a member of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors (NAWDAC);

4. female.

The use of the NAWDAC membership list was proposed for two reasons: 1) a definite list of these women, their titles and their locations was readily available; 2) it was thought that return questionnaires would be easier to obtain from an organized group of women.

With these decisions made, a probability sample was developed in the following manner:

1. A list of all the women student personnel administrators at the university level was compiled from the NAWDAC 1973-74 membership list. There were 476.

2. Each name selected was assigned a three-digit number from 001 to 476 by starting at the beginning of an alphabetical list by states and by name.

3. A table of random numbers was then used to make the selection of 150 names.

By limiting the group of administrators to be studied to women student personnel administrators on university campuses, the criteria used to determine leadership style had been made explicit. Responses were received from 124 respondents representing an eighty-three percent response rate (see Tables 3.1 and 3.2).

TABLE 3.1--Useability of subject responses for biographical question-naire

	N	%
Returned		
Complete	118	78.7
Incomplete	2	1.3
Undelivered	1	.7
Retired	3	2.0
Not Returned	26	17.3
TOTAL	150	100.0

TABLE 3.2--Useability of subject responses for the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire

	N	%
Returned		
Complete	116	77.3
Incomplete	4	2.7
Undelivered	1	.7
Retired	3	2.0
Not Returned	26	17.3
TOTAL	150	100.0

Source of Data

Data were collected by mailed questionnaires to the selected administrators. Two questionnaires were sent to each person. The information was obtained by a biographical questionnaire (Appendix A) and a leadership-style questionnaire (Fleishman, 1969).

The questionnaire method was used for several reasons. First, it would have been impossible to interview each woman in this study because of the large number in the sample and the fact that it was a national sample. Second, the use of the written questionnaire allowed each person time to think before answering such responses as number nineteen on the Biographical Data Sheet.

Development of the Biographical Questionnaire

The biographical questionnaire was designed to obtain information in four areas: 1) personal characteristics and background of each administrator; 2) professional characteristics of these women; 3) current professional position characteristics and 4) two questions sought opinions of these women. The questionnaire requested information on twenty-one items (see Appendix A).

The questionnaire was based, in part, on items suggested by similar questionnaires. Each item was evaluated by several persons, including the doctoral committee, women student personnel administrators, and graduate students. Some items were eliminated and

others were reconstructed.

The rationale for the questions included in this questionnaire is given below:

Group I: Personal Characteristics. Questions three, four, five, twelve, fifteen, sixteen, seventeen and eighteen were designed to gather personal characteristics and background data on each woman and to establish a response pattern indicative of each group of administrators.

Group II: Professional Characteristics. The professional characteristics of these women were measured by questions six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven, and thirteen. These questions were expected to contribute to the professional description indicative of each group of women administrators.

Group III: Job Characteristics. The women were also requested to record their current professional position characteristics. Questions fourteen and twenty-one were designed to gather this kind of information to see if broader generalizations could be made.

Group IV: Job Opinions. Two questions, nineteen and twenty, were designed to give the administrators an opportunity to express their opinions about their jobs and why they feel they are in these positions.

The above questions were treated statistically and were used to help interpret the data for the rest of the study.

Leadership Opinion Questionnaire

The second questionnaire this group of women administrators was asked to complete was the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ). The LOQ was used in an attempt to discover the style of leadership each administrator displayed. The questionnaire was developed by researchers at Ohio State University.

The LOQ gives scores on two dimensions of leadership--
Consideration (C) and Structure (S). These two dimensions are
defined as follows:

> Consideration (C) Reflects the extent to which an individual
> is likely to have job relationships with his subordinates
> characterized by mutual trust, respect for their ideas,
> consideration of their feelings, and a certain worth between
> himself and them. A high score is indicative of a climate
> of good rapport and two-way communication. A low score
> indicates the individual is likely to be more impersonal in
> his relations with group members.

> Structure (S) Reflects the extent to which an individual is
> likely to define and structure his own role and those of his
> subordinates toward goal attainment. A high score on this
> dimension characterizes individuals who play a very active
> role in directing group activities through planning, commun-
> icating information, scheduling, criticizing, trying out new
> ideas, and so forth. A low score characterizes individuals
> who are likely to be relatively inactive in giving direction in
> these ways (Fleishman, 1969).

It is emphasized in the test manual that these dimensions are
independent of one another. This means an administrator can be
high on both dimensions, low on both, or high on one dimension and
low on the other.

The questionnaire contains a total of forty items, twenty of
which are scored for Consideration and twenty for Structure. The
maximum score for each scale is eighty. The established reliability
for the LOQ was obtained by the split-half method (see Fleishman,
1969).

Fleishman (1969) points out that several important features of
this instrument have been tested. First, the "halo" and "social

desirability" tendencies, which have been found to be common in other instruments trying to identify leadership behaviors, does not seem to be operating in the LOQ. Secondly, another common failing of instruments in this area is their dependence on intelligence. The scores on this instrument are not dependent on the intelligence or the verbal ability of the administrator.

The LOQ has been used in a variety of organizational settings. The studies cited below are in the "Manual for Leadership Opinion Questionnaire" by Fleishman (1969).

Bass (1958) did a study in a large food-products corporation. The study was done in an effort to predict the success of supervisors. The LOQ was administered to forty-two sales supervisors. Three years later the same group of men were rated by top management in overall effectiveness. A salesman was rated high if "since he has taken over the job, his subordinates are showing signs of doing a better job, getting more done, staying on the job, exhibiting more satisfaction, and selling more." The correlation between these ratings and Consideration is .32, which is statistically significant at the .05 level. Five years later performance ratings were obtained again. The criterion this time was the composite of ratings by five supervisors in the organization. For twenty-six sales supervisors still on the job, the Consideration scale had a validity of .37. It was found that the Consideration scale was more predicative of a salesman's ability over a period of time than such

measures as personality, sales knowledge, and intelligence.

In another study which was undertaken by Rim (1965), the rela-
tion between risk-taking behavior and the leadership attitudes of
Consideration and Structure, as measured by the LOQ, was explored.
To obtain a risk-taking score, the sum of the lowest probabilities
designated by each of two groups of subjects (twenty-seven female
head nurses and thirty-nine industrial supervisors), was based on
six problems. Each person "filled out a risk-taking booklet, which
yielded an initial risk-taking score." The subjects were then
placed in groups of four or five to discuss and reach a group decision
on each problem presented in the booklet. Afterward, each person
filled out the booklet again and this provided each subject with an
after score.

The results showed that male supervisors scoring high on both
dimensions of the LOQ, and head nurses scoring high on Structure
tended to take higher initial risks than their colleagues. Those from
both groups scoring high on both Consideration and Structure appeared
to have greater influence on the groups which lead to a shift in the
risky direction. Those individuals who scored low on both dimensions
appeared to be the most influenced by others in the group.

Normative data on the LOQ and its two dimensions have been
obtained and supported by other researchers. Parker (1963), Fleish-
man and Ko (1962), and Litzinger (1965) are but a few who have used

the LOQ in a variety of circumstances. The results of each of these studies have all been consistent and have supported the importance of these two dimensions in identifying leadership style.

Procedures

Confidentiality

In order that each respondent's confidentiality would be protected, names were deleted from the questionnaires after they were recorded. The names were used only for follow-up purposes.

Procedures Used to Achieve a High Response Rate

Mail questionnaires are often criticized because of the low response rate they usually generate. Also, the characteristics of the non-respondents may be significantly different from those of the respondents, making it difficult to generalize from the returned questionnaires to the rest of the population (Kerlinger, 1964).

With this in mind, a great effort was made to achieve a high return rate of questionnaires. The procedures used for the mailing and follow-up of the questionnaires were those recommended by Robin (1965).

Pre-Letter. All of the women administrators in the sample were sent a letter by Dr. Laurine E. Fitzgerald, Vice-President in charge of program development for NAWDAC, prior to the mailing

of the questionnaires. In her letter, Dr. Fitzgerald informed each person about the study, its purposes, and the support it was receiving from NAWDAC. The letter encouraged each woman's support in completing the questionnaires which were to follow in three days. Leslie (1970) recommended that the stationery used for the pre-letters be such that the respondents could "identify" favorably with someone involved in the study or an organization backing the study. This further encourages subject participation. Dr. Fitzgerald (who is well known by NAWDAC's membership) used the organization's stationery so that both of the above criteria were met. The pre-letter is exhibited in Appendix B.

Questionnaires and Cover Letter. The questionnaires and cover letter were sent three days after the pre-letter. The Western Michigan University's Counseling and Personnel Department provided the stationery for the cover letter. Again, this stationery is easily related to by women in the student personnel area. Confidentiality was emphasized in the letter to assure each subject who might be concerned about their response and how it would be used. (See Appendix B) Stamped, self-addressed envelopes were included in the packet.

Follow-up. Two weeks after the mailing of the questionnaires, a post card was sent to remind those who had not responded. A copy of this reminder is presented in Appendix B.

Methods of Analyzing the Data

The methods of analyzing the data were chosen according to the questions gathered.

Analysis of Biographical Questionnaire

Descriptive and analytical statistics were used to illustrate the data gathered by the Biographical Questionnaire. The frequencies of titles used were listed (Table 4.14) for each administrative group. Most of the variables were placed in categories for each administrative level with frequency and percent of respondents computed. A Chi Square analysis was used also to compare significant differences between the two management groups.

All of the questions were comparatively analyzed except for question nineteen, which was open ended, and question twenty. Question nineteen was summarized and frequencies of responses recorded for each group while in question twenty each item was ranked by frequency.

Analysis of Leadership Opinion Questionnaire

The questionnaire yields two scores, one for Consideration (C) and one for Structure (S). Alternatives to each item are scored 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4. There are twenty items for each scale. The maximum possible score is eighty on each scale. Scores generally range from thirty to seventy (Fleishman, 1969).

In the various validity studies done on the LOQ, it was found that in general the most undesirable situation is when the administrator is low in both Consideration and Structure. "The High Structure-Low Consideration supervisor is more likely to show more turnover, grievances, and stress among his subordinates (Fleishman, 1969, p. 4)." The manual also describes a study by Fleishman and Harris that showed evidence "that managers high in Consideration can be higher in Structure without these adverse effects."

The scores for each group of women administrators were compiled to see if there was a pattern that emerged for each group. This was then described, compared, and analyzed. It was assumed that the successful student personnel administrator would be high on each scale.

In order to compare the scale of these women, means and standard deviations were used. See Tables 4.32 and 4.33.

Summary

Chapter III is a discussion of the methods and procedures which were used in conducting the study. The chapter consists of a definition of the population, method for developing the sample, a description of the instruments used, the procedures used to obtain the data, and the review of the procedures used for analyzing the data.

CHAPTER IV

REPORT OF THE FINDINGS

Analysis of the Data

The responses to the Biographical Questionnaire (Table 3.1) were analyzed, tallied, and are presented in the following tables. These tables were set up so that each one summarizes and indicates the frequencies (f) of each response, the percentages (%) of the responses for each variable and presents the chi square values (X^2) to test for the relation between level of management and each response variable. The questions used to develop the Biographical Questionnaire were designed around four areas: personal characteristics; professional characteristics; job characteristics; and job opinions. The findings of the biographical data were presented in each of the above categories. Computations for each variable were recorded only for those women administrators who responded to a particular item.

The data were derived from a national sample of women student personnel administrators at the university level. This study included 118 women for whom rather complete data were available.

62

Seventy-seven of these administrators were classified as upper-management and forty-one as middle-management. The respondents were assigned to a management group. If they answered each part of question 14 (see Biographical Questionnaire, Appendix A) affirmatively they were classified as upper-management, otherwise they were considered middle-management.

Chi-square analysis was used to ascertain relationships between upper-management and both groups and selected variables. t-test analysis was also used to determine any mean difference in scores on the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire between the two management levels. This was done for each dimension (Consideration and Structure) of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire and the two levels of management.

Although descriptive studies have potential as a tool or technique for gathering evidence, the application of a statistical analysis of interpreting information is a more valid use for this study as it then can apply to women student personnel administrators "now, in the past, or in the future (Van Dalen and Meyer, 1972, p. 204)." Good (1966), in his book Essentials of Educational Research, makes it clear that ". . . descriptive-survey studies are accurate only for the time and sample represented (p. 63)." This study may serve as a yardstick to measure women administrators outside the sample in student personnel services.

In summary, a three-phase analysis was used in analyzing the results of the dissertation. A brief description of the sample was given, relationships between variables and leadership style were described, and relationships between variables and level of leadership were coded.

A Profile of Women Student Personnel Administrators

Table 4.1 provides a brief statistical description of the women student personnel administrators in the sample. The number of respondents (denoted by N in the table) for each variable was different because there were a few non-respondents to some questions.

The average administrator responding to the Biographical Questionnaire was 39.7 years old and she had been married for an average of 6.5 years. The average number of children was 1.2. The mean size of the universities in which the women were employed was 10.7 thousand. The average woman student personnel administrator had spent a little over five years in post high school training. Her mean salary was 11.4 thousand dollars.

In summary, the average woman student personnel officer in this study was forty years old and employed by a large university (10,000 or more). She had received a masters degree, earned about $11,000 and, if married, had one child.

Among the two management level groups identified for use in

this study there appears to be an even age distribution (Table 4.2).
A majority, about 50.7 percent, of the upper-management women administrators were recorded in the 31-50 year age category.

There was, however, a significantly larger proportion of younger women in the middle-management group with 68.3 percent reporting that they were in the 20-40 age group. However, the chi square value (6.88) shows there was no significant age difference between the two management groups.

TABLE 4.1--Profile of selected biographical variables for student personnel administrators

Variable	N	$\overline{X}$
Age	118	39.7
Years married	40	6.5
Number of children	57	1.2
Size university employed	118	10.67 (thousand)
Years in post high school education	118	5.2
Salary	118	11.44 (thousand)

TABLE 4.2--Ages of women student personnel officers

Age	Upper-management		Middle-management		Chi Square Value
	f	%	f	%	
20-30	16	20.8	15	36.6	
31-40	18	23.4	13	31.7	
41-50	21	27.3	5	12.2	
51+	22	28.5	8	19.5	
Total	77	100.0	41	100.0	6.88*

*not significant at pL .05 (df = 3)

The largest proportion of both groups of women officers were not married (Table 4.3). As noted, 49.3 percent of the upper-management and 53.7 percent of the middle-management group reported not being married. When these figures are coupled with the fact that 16.9 percent of the upper-management women and 12.2 percent of the middle-management women were either divorced or widowed, it then was apparent that about two-thirds of each group were not married. However, when these data were analyzed statistically, the chi square value (1.63) showed no significant relation between marital status of the groups and level of management.

The tabulation in Table 4.4 reports the length of time the women in each group had been married. Of those women in both groups who were married, almost half of them (46.2 percent for upper-management and 42.8 percent for middle-management) had been married five years or more. Those that recorded being married for more than ten years made up the second largest group. Of the upper-management, 42.3 percent were in the second largest category as were 35.7 percent of the middle-management group. There was no significant difference in the length of time the women in each group were married at the .05 level.

From the tabulation in Table 4.5, summarizing data in regard to the number of children the women administrators have, it is apparent that the women in the sample who were married, regardless

TABLE 4.3--Marital status of upper-management and middle-management women student personnel administrators

Marital Status	Upper-Management f	Upper-Management %	Middle-Management f	Middle-Management %	Chi Square Value
Single	38	49.3	22	53.7	
Married	26	33.8	14	34.1	
Divorced	9	11.7	2	4.9	
Widowed	4	5.2	3	7.3	
Total	77	100.0	41	100.0	1.63*

*not significant at pL .05 (df = 3)

TABLE 4.4--Length of time married for upper-management and middle-management women student personnel administrators

Length of Time Married	Upper-Management f	Upper-Management %	Middle-Management f	Middle-Management %	Chi Square Value
Less than 2 yrs.	3	11.5	3	21.5	
5 - 10 yrs.	12	46.5	6	42.8	
More than 10 yrs.	11	42.3	5	35.7	
Total	26	100.0	14	100.0	0.714*

*not significant at pL .05 (df = 2)

TABLE 4.5--The number of children of upper-management and middle-management women student personnel administrators

Number of Children	Upper-Management f	Upper-Management %	Middle-Management f	Middle-Management %	Chi Square Value
None	19	48.7	9	50.0	
1	5	12.8	4	22.2	
2 or more	15	38.5	5	27.8	
Total	39	100.0	18	100.0	1.09*

*not significant at pL .05 (df = 2)

of group, the majority had no children. However, in the upper-management group, the second largest percentage (38. 5 percent) had two or more children. As indicated by the chi square value (1. 09) there was no significant difference between upper-management and middle-management women who were married and had children.

Table 4. 6 reports the number of siblings for each group of student personnel administrators. As may be observed in Table 4. 6, a great majority of the women administrators were only children or had only one sibling. Of the upper-management women, 57. 2 percent were in this category as were 65. 8 percent of the middle-management women. The next largest category for each group of women is the one which classifies officers who had three siblings. About one-fourth of the women at each level came from families that included three brothers and/or sisters. It should be noted that only 13 percent of the upper-management and less than one-tenth (9. 7 percent) of the middle-management had come from families with four or more siblings. The difference between the two groups was not statistically significant at the . 05 level (x^2 value 5. 66).

Table 4. 7 contains a description of the sibling order for the women in the sample. Of those administrators who had brothers and sisters, more than half in each group were first born children and about three-fourths of each group recorded themselves as the

oldest female child. Although slightly less than half of the sample recorded themselves as youngest children, the proportion was still high. To account for this, it must be pointed out that some women can be the oldest female child and still be the youngest child. Such an overlapping accounted for the high percentage in each sibling category. There was no significant difference in birth order between the two groups at the .05 probability level.

Data reporting whether the mothers of the administrators in this sample were employed while the subjects were children is presented in Table 4.8. The majority of the mothers of the women in this study were not employed during the childhood of the subjects. Table 4.8 indicates that 62.3 percent of the mothers of upper-management women and 75.6 percent of the middle-management women's mothers were not employed during the early period of the administrator's life. The chi square value was not significant at the .05 level.

The level of employment of each management groups' mothers is represented in Table 4.9. Of those mothers of the upper-management women who were employed, an equal number were employed at the professional and/or managerial level. Only thirty percent of the middle-management officers' mothers were employed at one of these levels. Table 4.9 gives a further breakdown (in percentages) of the employment level of these mothers of each group of officers.

TABLE 4. 6--Numbers of siblings of upper-management and middle-management women student personnel administrators

Number of Siblings	Upper-management f	Upper-management %	Middle-management f	Middle-management %	Chi Square Value
None	17	22. 1	6	14. 6	
One	27	35. 1	21	51. 2	
Two	16	20. 7	8	19. 6	
Three	7	9. 1	2	4. 9	
Four	4	5. 2	2	4. 9	
Five	2	2. 6	0	0	
Six	1	1. 3	1	2. 4	
Seven	0	0	0	0	
Eight	2	2. 6	0	0	
Nine	1	1. 3	1	2. 4	
Total	77	100. 0	41	100. 0	5. 66*

*not significant at pL . 05 (df = 9)

TABLE 4. 7--Sibling order of upper-management and middle-management women student personnel administrators

Sibling Order	Upper-management f	Upper-management %	Middle-management f	Middle-management %	Chi Square Value
First born					
Yes	49	63. 6	24	58. 5	
No	28	36. 4	17	41. 5	
Total	77	100. 0	41	100. 0	0. 29*
Oldest female					
Yes	61	79. 2	30	73. 2	
No	16	20. 8	11	26. 8	
Total	77	100. 0	41	100. 0	0. 555*
Youngest child					
Yes	35	45. 5	20	48. 8	
No	42	54. 5	21	51. 2	
Total	77	100. 0	41	100. 0	4. 168*

*not significant at pL . 05 (df = 1)

TABLE 4.8--Mothers employed of upper-management and middle-
management women student personnel administrators

Mothers Employed	Upper-management		Middle-management		Chi Square Value
	f	%	f	%	
Yes	29	37.7	10	24.4	
No	48	62.3	31	75.6	
Total	77	100.0	41	100.0	2.129*

*not significant at pL .05 (df = 1)

TABLE 4.9--Level of employment of working mothers of upper-
management and middle-management women student personnel
administrators

Level of mother's Employment	Upper-management		Middle-management		Chi Square Value
	f	%	f	%	
Professional	10	34.4	1	10.0	
Managerial	10	34.4	2	20.0	
Service	4	13.8	4	40.0	
Other	5	17.3	3	30.0	
Total	29	100.0	10	100.0	5.16*

*not significant at pL .05 (df = 3)

TABLE 4.10--Level of employment of fathers of upper-management
and middle-management women student personnel administrators

Level of father's Employment	Upper-management		Middle-management		Chi Square Value
	f	%	f	%	
Professional	25	32.5	16	39.0	
Managerial	18	23.4	10	24.4	
Service	9	11.6	5	12.2	
Other	24	31.2	9	22.0	
Unknown	1	1.3	1	2.4	
Total	77	100.0	41	100.0	1.16*

*not significant at pL .05 (df = 4)

These findings indicate no significant relation between mothers' employment and level of management held by their offspring ($X^2 = 5.16$).

The statistics for the employment levels of each group's fathers is displayed in Table 4.10. The largest percent of the fathers of these two groups of women were employed in a professional field. For the upper-management administrators, the second highest category for their fathers' employment level was that classified as "other." The middle-management women recorded the managerial level as the second largest category for their fathers' employment level. One woman in each group was unable to give any information in response to this question. One father had died during the administrator's early childhood and the other father was unknown. These findings indicate no significant relation between fathers' employment and level of management held by their daughters ($X^2 = 1.16$).

Table 4.11 records the responses of each group of women on the question which asked which parent had the greater influence on them. Note that 14.3 percent of the upper-management and 22.0 percent of the middle-management women did not make a choice. They felt that both parents were influential. Of the remaining women in both groups, the majority felt their mothers had a greater influence on them. There was no statistical difference between the management groups in response to this item at .05 level ($X^2 = .49$).

The tabulation in Table 4.12 summarizes the data received on feminist affiliation. Among those women who reported affiliating with a feminist group, the upper-management group was evenly split. The middle-management officers were more interested in feminist activities. Sixty-one percent of the middle-management group had affiliated with a feminist group within the past five years, whereas less than half (49.4 percent) of the upper-management women had joined a feminist group. However, this difference is not statistically significant at the .05 level.

Table 4.13 depicts the recorded ages of the women in each management group who have affiliated with a feminist group in the past five years. The upper-management women in student personnel services are evenly distributed by age as to feminist affiliation. Of the 49.4 percent of the upper-management group who recorded themselves as feminist, about twelve percent fell into each age group. The middle-management women, however, are heavily skewed toward younger women who have affiliated with a feminist group. Of the sixty-one percent who record themselves as feminist, 48.8 percent are in the twenty to forty age group.

When the sample was categorized into two age groups (20-40, 41 plus), there was a relationship between younger women and feminist affiliation. The chi square value was 6.68, which is significant at the .05 probability level (df = 1).

TABLE 4.11--Parent which had the greater influence

Parent	Upper-management		Middle-management		Chi Square
	f	%	f	%	Value
Mother	44	57.1	19	46.3	
Father	22	28.6	13	31.7	
Both	11	14.3	9	22.0	
Total	77	100.0	41	100.0	0.49*

*not significant at pL .05 (df = 2)

TABLE 4.12--Feminist affiliation

Feminist Affiliation	Upper-management		Middle-management		Chi Square
	f	%	f	%	Value
Yes	38	49.4	25	61.0	
No	39	50.6	16	39.0	
Total	77	100.0	41	100.0	1.4*

*not significant at pL .05 (df = 1)

TABLE 4.13--Ages of feminist by management group

	Age	Feminist		Non-Feminist	
		f	%	f	%
Upper management	20-30	10	12.9	5	7.7
	31-40	10	12.9	8	10.4
	41-50	9	11.8	12	15.6
	51+	9	11.8	13	16.9
	Total	38	49.4	39	50.6
Middle management	20-30	10	24.4	5	12.2
	31-40	10	24.4	3	7.3
	41-50	3	7.3	2	4.9
	51+	2	4.9	6	14.6
	Total	25	61.0	16	29.0

Table 4.14 represents a summary of the titles reported by women student personnel administrators at each level. (For a complete list see Appendix D.) The title of associate dean was reported eighteen times by upper-management women for a percentage of 23.4. Assistant dean of students was used fifteen times by middle-management women for a 36.6 percentage. Note that titles did not denote management level. For example, four deans of women did not have total responsibility for developing policies, procedures and programs. Therefore, each of these women were classified as middle-management.

Eight of the upper-management women (10.4 percent) and four of the middle-management officers (9.8 percent) had dual titles. For example, several of the women had the title associate dean of students and also the title dean of women.

In summary, about one-fourth of the upper-management administrators reported titles of dean of some student personnel area and an equal number reported the title of associate dean. Of the remaining titles reported by upper-management women, the greatest number were classified as directors. The directors accounted for about seventeen percent of the upper-management group.

The middle-management officers recorded the most titles in the assistant dean category. However, nine women (about twenty-

two percent) reported the title of dean. Of the remaining women in middle-management, 14.4 percent (six administrators) listed themselves as director of a student personnel unit.

Table 4.14 shows that only one woman had attained the top student personnel position (vice-president) at the university level in this sample. She was a mature, single woman at a medium-size university.

Professional Characteristics

The sizes of the institutions employing the women in this population sample is presented in Table 4.15. Generally speaking, more women from both groups were employed by universities with enrollments of over 10,000. Forty-nine percent of the upper-management women and sixty-three percent of the middle-management officers indicated that they held positions in larger institutions. The upper-management women were somewhat more evenly distributed by university size. The middle-management officers tended to be employed more frequently in the larger universities. The chi square value, however, was not significant at .05 level.

The salary distribution for each group of respondents seemed to be larger at the lower end of the scale. Table 4.16 shows that thirty-five upper-management women and thirty-one middle-management women student personnel officers employed by universities were

TABLE 4.14--A summary of position titles of upper-management and middle-management women student personnel administrators

Title	Upper-management f	%	Middle-management f	%
1. Vice-president	1	1.4		
2. Assistant Vice-president	3	3.8		
3. Dean	19	25.0	5	12.2
4. Associate Dean	18	23.4	4	9.8
5. Assistant Dean	6	7.8	15	36.6
6. Director	13	16.6	5	12.0
7. Associate or Assistant Director	5	7.0	3	7.3
8. Coordinator	6	7.8	1	2.4
9. Associate or Assistant Coordinator			3	7.3

TABLE 4.15--Sizes of employing universities

University Size	Upper-management f	%	Middle-management f	%	Chi Square Value
Under 2,500	9	11.6	2	4.8	
2,500-5,999	10	13.0	4	9.8	
6,000-10,000	20	26.0	9	22.0	
Over 10,000	38	49.4	26	63.4	
Total	77	100.0	41	100.0	2.72*

*not significant at pL .05 (df = 3)

TABLE 4.16--Salary levels of women administrators

Salary Level	Upper-management f	%	Middle-management f	%	Chi Square
To $14,000	35	45.5	31	75.6	
$15,000-19,999	29	37.7	10	24.4	
$20,000-24,999	10	13.0	0	0	
Above $25,000	3	3.8	0	0	
Total	77	100.0	41	100.0	12.69*

*significant at pL .05 (df = 3)

in the "To $14,000" per year salary category. Only 3.9 percent of the upper-management women and none of those at the middle-management level were in the "Above $25,000" salary category. The difference in salary schedules between the two groups was significant at the .05 level of probability.

In spite of the small differential in employment patterns by university size, upper-management women did differ significantly in salary range. The results showed that upper-management women were receiving larger salaries, as logically, they should. The data further suggested, however, that there were few additional differentiating characteristics. For example, there were no differences in the number of professional experiences for each group nor were there real differences in education or training. Therefore, salary difference may represent no more than the level of job complexity or responsibility.

In Table 4.17 are reported the academic degrees held by women student personnel administrators at both management levels. Obviously the master's degree was the most common one held by women student personnel administrators at both management levels. None of the 118 respondents in the sample population had a specialist degree nor were any of them pursuing this degree. Another significant fact was that one-third of the respondents in the middle-management and one-fourth of those at the upper-management level had an earned doctorate.

At the other end of the scale, 10.4 percent of those women in upper-management had only a bachelor's degree. The chi square value of 3.87 is not significant at the .05 level.

Tables 4.18 and 4.19 depict the number of women pursuing advanced degrees and which degrees are being sought by each group of managers. Of those women in each group pursuing another degree, 9.1 percent of the upper-management women and twenty-two percent of the middle-management administrators were currently enrolled in a doctoral program. However, of the 16.9 percent in upper-management seeking another degree, 7.8 percent were enrolled as master's degree candidates. Whereas 34.9 percent of the middle-management women were going on in their academic work, 9.8 percent were seeking a master's degree. Four of the women in the middle-management area and one in upper-management indicated that they were pursuing a second masters. The differences between the two groups were not significant at the .05 level.

However, another significant professional difference between the two management groups was in that middle-management women were more likely to be involved in advanced degree programs than were the upper-management women. The difference was significant at the .05 level.

Table 4.20 summarizes the data recorded on the fields of preparation for the 118 women student personnel administrators at

TABLE 4. 17--Degrees held by upper-management and middle-management women student personnel administrators

Degree	Upper-management		Middle-management		Chi Square Value
	f	%	f	%	
BA	8	10. 4	1	2. 4	
MA	54	70. 1	35	85. 4	
Doctorate	15	19. 5	5	12. 2	
Total	77	100. 0	41	100. 0	3. 87*

*not significant at pL . 05 (df = 2)

TABLE 4. 18--Number of women pursuing advanced degrees

Pursuing Degree	Upper-management		Middle-management		Chi Square Value
	f	%	f	%	
Yes	13	16. 9	14	34. 1	
No	64	83. 1	27	51. 9	
Total	77	100. 0	41	100. 0	4. 51*

*significant at the pL . 05

TABLE 4. 19--Degrees being sought

Degree	Upper-management		Middle-management		Chi Square Value
	f	%	f	%	
Masters	6	46. 3	4	28. 6	
Doctorate	7	53. 7	9	64. 3	
Other	0	0. 0	1	7. 1	
Total	13	100. 0	14	100. 0	1. 615*

*not significant at pL . 05 (df = 3)

the university level. A majority of the women in both groups had a background in some area of education. Most of the women (about fifty percent of the upper-management and 58.5 percent of the middle-management) held at least one degree in counseling and personnel. With the majority of these women holding advanced degrees in counseling and personnel, it was evident that they had strong academic training for their positions. Within the group labeled "other," many had done their college work in home economics or women's physical education.

The kind of institution in which the women were employed is recorded in Table 4.21. The majority (62.7 percent) of women student personnel officers in the sample held previous jobs in institutions of higher education. The remainder of the sample recorded a variety of previous work experiences. The only other percentage that showed any significance was the 5.3 percent of the upper-management and 9.8 percent of the middle-management women who reported previous positions with non-profit organizations. The other alternative choice that was significant as a previous position among the institutional types was the secondary education selection. In this category 3.9 percent of the upper-level officers and 4.9 percent of the middle-level officers reported having immediate past positions.

Table 4.22 reports the data on number of jobs held by women

TABLE 4. 20--Field of preparation (by last degree)

Field	Upper-management f	Upper-management %	Middle-management f	Middle-management %
Education				
Administration	9	11. 9	3	7. 3
Counseling & Personnel	38	50. 0	24	58. 5
Educational Psychology	6	7. 9	1	2. 4
General	5	6. 6	4	9. 8
Humanities	5	6. 6	5	12. 2
Sciences	0	0. 0	0	0. 0
Social Sciences	4	5. 3	0	0. 0
Other	0	11. 9	4	9. 8
Total	76*	100. 0	41	100. 0

*one respondent did not answer this question

TABLE 4. 21--Kind of institution of previous position

Institution	Upper-management f	Upper-management %	Middle-management f	Middle-management %
Higher Education	64	84. 3	30	73. 2
Secondary Education	3	3. 9	2	4. 9
Business or Industry	1	1. 3	0	0. 0
Government	2	2. 6	1	2. 4
No previous position	1	1. 3	3	7. 3
Non-profit organization	4	5. 3	4	9. 8
Other	1	1. 3	1	2. 4
Total	76*	100. 0	41	100. 0

*one respondent did not answer this question

student personnel administrators. Most of the women in both groups had held several professional positions prior to their present job. Nearly half of the upper-management women had three other professional experiences before coming to their present position. Those women who constitute the middle-management group had more jobs. Almost two-thirds of this group had from three to five previous positions. However, the two groups were not found to be significantly different at the .05 level.

Table 4.23 summarizes the data received on the years spent in a previous position. About one-fourth of the women in both groups spent only one year in their previous position. However, at the upper-management level, almost another one-fourth of the women spent six or more years in their former job. The middle-management group, on the other hand, tended to have spent fewer years in their past positions. About forty-six percent of the women in middle-management had spent two years or less in previous positions.

Table 4.24 depicts the access route from previous position to present position. The majority of women at both management levels held previous positions in administration. Very few came from faculty ranks. As a matter of fact, only 2.6 percent of the upper-management group and 4.9 percent of the middle-management women were in the faculty category. It is interesting to note, too, that very few women were students immediately preceding their

TABLE 4.22--Number of professional jobs held (no more than five)

Number of Jobs	Upper-management f	Upper-management %	Middle-management f	Middle-management %	Chi Square Value
None	5	6.5	4	9.8	
One	9	11.7	4	9.8	
Two	18	23.3	6	14.6	
Three	17	22.1	10	24.4	
Four	7	9.1	9	22.0	
Five	21	27.3	8	19.4	
Total	77	100.0	41	100.0	5.10*

*not significant at pL .05 (df = 5)

TABLE 4.23--Years spent in previous job

Years	Upper-management f	Upper-management %	Middle-management f	Middle-management %
No data	1	1.3	6	14.6
One	21	27.3	10	24.4
Two	14	18.9	9	22.0
Three	5	6.3	5	12.2
Four	9	11.5	5	12.2
Five	8	11.5	2	4.8
Six plus	18	23.4	4	9.8
Total	77	100.0	41	100.0

TABLE 4.24--Access route from previous position to present position

Route	Upper-management f	Upper-management %	Middle-management f	Middle-management %
No data	1	1.3	3	7.3
Administration	62	80.5	30	73.3
Faculty	2	2.6	2	4.9
Clerical	0	0.0	0	0.0
Student	2	2.6	2	4.9
Other	10	12.9	4	9.6
Total	77	100.0	41	100.0

present position, indicating that prior experience is required for jobs at these levels.

Table 4.25 records the publishing record of the administrators. It is apparent that 69.5 percent of these student personnel officers had not published professional articles, etc., in the past five years. A little over two-thirds of the upper-management women and almost three-fourths of the middle-management officers had not published. There was no statistical difference between the publishing records of the two management groups at the .05 level.

Table 4.26 shows the kind of publications authored by the women in each management group. Of those who had published during the past five years, none had authored a book. The majority of the upper-management and middle-management women student personnel officers who had published wrote articles. There was no significant difference at the .05 level in the kinds of publications each group produced.

Table 4.27 summarizes the recorded number of women who held an office in a professional organization during the past five years. All of the women in this sample belonged to at least one professional organization (NAWDAC) since this was contingent on their selection for this study. More than half of the women, however, in both of these management groups had held offices in a professional organization within the past five years. There was, moreover, no

TABLE 4.25--Publishing record

Published	Upper-management		Middle-management		Chi Square
	f	%	f	%	Value
Yes	25	32.5	11	26.8	
No	52	67.5	30	73.2	
Total	77	100.0	41	100.0	.04*

*not significant at pL .05 (df = 1)

TABLE 4.26--Publications in past five years

What Published	Upper-management		Middle-management		Chi Square
	f	%	f	%	Value
Books	0	0.0	0	0.0	
Articles	18	72.0	6	54.5	
Other	7	28.0	5	45.5	
Total	25	100.0	11	100.0	1.04*

*not significant at pL .05 (df = 1)

TABLE 4.27--Number of women who have held offices in professional organizations in past five years

Held an Office	Upper-management		Middle-management		Chi Square
	f	%	f	%	
Yes	45	58.4	21	51.2	
No	32	41.6	20	48.8	
Total	77	100.0	41	100.0	.057*

*not significant at pL .05 (df = 1)

significant difference between the groups' involvement at the .05 level of significance.

The tabulation in Table 4.28 summarizes the data on membership in professional organizations (other than NAWDAC). For the upper-management women, the main thrust of involvement was in ACPA and NASPA. APGA and membership in residual organizations were a close second; AAHA ranked third. The interest in NASPA on the part of these women was interesting since NASPA has had almost exclusively a male membership in the past.

The middle-management women also reported considerable interest in NASPA. Twenty-four point five percent of this group reported belonging to this organization.

Table 4.29 records a picture that reflects on the number of national organizations these women elected to join. A majority of the women elected membership in at least two organizations other than NAWDAC. The upper-management group were slightly more active as nearly three-fifths of them held at least two other professional memberships.

Analysis of Job Characteristics

Table 4.30 summarizes the results of the administrators' classification of their jobs. The majority of women in the sample saw themselves as holding student personnel positions at the middle-

TABLE 4.28--Membership in professional organizations

Organization*	Upper-management		Middle-management	
	f	%	f	%
AAHE	12	12.2	0	0.0
AAUP	0	0.0	2	4.1
AAUW	10	10.2	4	8.2
ACPA	19	19.4	10	20.4
APA	2	2.0	1	2.0
APGA	18	18.4	8	16.3
NASPA	19	19.4	12	24.5
Other	18	18.4	12	24.5
Total	98	100.0	49	100.0

*AAHE - American Association of Higher Education
 AAUP - American Association of University Professors
 AAUW - American Association of University Women
 ACPA - American College Personnel Association
 APA   - American Psychological Association
 APGA - Personnel and Guidance Association
 NASPA - National Association of Student Personnel Administrators

TABLE 4.29--Number of national memberships not including NAWDAC

Number of Memberships	Upper-management		Middle management	
	f	%	f	%
None	26	33.6	14	34.1
One	18	23.3	12	29.3
Two	19	24.6	10	24.4
Three or more	14	18.6	5	12.2
Total	77	100.0	41	100.0

TABLE 4.30--How women student personnel administrators view
their position level

Position Level	Upper-management f	Upper-management %	Middle-management f	Middle-management %	Chi Square Value
Top	12	16.1	1	2.4	
Middle	62	80.9	30	73.2	
Other	2	3.0	10	24.4	
Total	76*	100.0	41	100.0	16.805**

*one respondent didn't answer this question
**significant at pL .05 (df = 2)

management level; however, according to criteria adopted for this
study, the majority (77 of the 118) were categorized as upper-man-
agement. Upper-management level was defined as responsibility
for developing policies and budgets and overseeing an organizational
unit or units. There was a significant difference between the two
groups of women as to how they answered the question. Only one
middle-management woman categorized herself as top-management.

Question 21 (see the Biographical Questionnaire, Appendix A)
not only allowed the women to select what they thought their manage-
ment level was, but also allowed them to choose "other" and then
define what they meant. Summarized below are some of these
comments: (not direct quotes)

1. The title is top-management, the responsibilities are
middle-management

2. Student personnel administrators are not much of anything

3. Responsibilities are shared

4. This position is staff, not line

5. Depends on "whim" of the supervisor

6. Low (this from an assistant dean in a large university)

7. Lower management

Analysis of Job Opinions

Two questions sought to elicit reactions from the respondents about their jobs (see questions 19 and 20, Biographical Questionnaire, Appendix A). Question 19 asks each woman student personnel administrator "What would you consider your major problem as a woman administrator?" Those responses which seemed to be most universal can be found in Appendix C. However, there were several themes that can be presented here.

A number of the women in both groups felt for several reasons that being a female was a real problem. Many (46.6 percent) commented that they were not taken seriously; thought of as a woman first and an administrator second; not included in the informal, but important decision-making circles; not considered seriously as career oriented; seldom considered for jobs outside female-oriented fields; not considered an equal by male administrators; and overtly discriminated against in salaries and promotions.

A number of the women were less concerned about being a

woman administrator and more concerned about being a <u>good</u> administrator. These women mentioned problems common to all administrators, such as job infringement on private life, effective decision making, viable leadership style, and effective use of time.

Only two women commented that they found it difficult to mesh their professional life with their home life--both of these women were married.

Question 20 (Biographical Questionnaire, Appendix A) was an attempt to determine why these women thought they were in their present positions. When the data were examined for this question, the majority of the respondents felt that they had their present positions because of their skill, qualifications and abilities. Very few (unless the position was that of Dean of Women) felt that sex was the first determinant for being hired.

Tables 4.31 and 4.32 depict in frequencies and percentages how each management group ranked the influential factors which were the determinants for being in their present positions.

Question 20 allowed each woman to comment, if she wished, to qualify her rankings or give further reasons as to why she thought she achieved her present position. These comments can be reviewed in Appendix C. A few of the administrators mentioned their race as one factor in helping get into their present position. Others mentioned knowledge, ability to work hard and one straightforward comment was

TABLE 4. 31--Ranked frequencies of influential factors for being in present position as seen by upper-management women

Influential Factors	No response		1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Skill	17	22.1	14	18.2	7	4.1	10	13.0	16	20.5	8	10.4	5	6.5	0	0.0	10	0.0
Qualifications	12	15.6	25	32.5	15	19.5	13	16.9	8	10.4	4	5.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Sex	32	41.6	5	6.5	5	6.5	5	6.5	0	0.0	6	7.8	20	26.0	4	5.2	0	0.0
Training and background	10	13.0	20	26.0	10	13.0	9	11.7	10	13.0	12	15.6	6	7.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
Communication ability	10	13.0	17	22.1	11	14.3	13	16.9	8	10.4	10	13.0	8	10.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
Demonstrated leadership ability	14	18.2	20	26.0	14	18.2	8	10.4	12	15.6	8	10.4	0	0.0	1	1.3	0	0.0
No other candidate	58	75.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.3	2	2.6	15	19.5	1	1.3
Other	59	76.6	6	7.8	2	2.6	3	3.9	1	1.3	0	0.0	1	1.3	3	3.9	2	2.6

TABLE 4.32--Ranked frequencies of influential factors for being in present position as seen by middle-management women

Influential Factors	No response		1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Skill	8	19.5	5	12.2	5	12.2	6	14.6	5	12.2	9	22.0	3	7.3				
Qualifications	4	9.8	12	29.3	7	17.1	7	17.1	7	17.1	3	7.3	1	2.4				
Sex	18	43.4	1	2.4	3	7.3	2	4.9	1	2.4	5	12.2	8	19.5	3	7.3		
Training and background	3	7.3	7	17.1	11	26.8	7	17.1	10	24.4	3	7.3						
Communication ability	7	17.1	10	24.4	4	9.8	6	14.6	4	9.8	5	12.2	5	12.2				
Demonstrated leadership ability	7	17.1	17	41.5	6	14.6	4	9.8	2	4.9	3	7.3	1	2.4	1	2.4		
No other candidate	28	68.3	1	2.4	1	2.4	1	2.4	2	4.9	0	0.0	2	4.9	5	12.2	1	2.4
Other	35	85.4	3	7.3	0	0.0	1	2.4	1	2.4	1	2.4	0					

that no one else would do the job. A couple of the women stated that they had started in a part-time position and were promoted into a full-time job at a later date.

Analysis of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire

Data concerning the leadership styles of the sample were gathered by the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (Fleishman, 1969). Responses to this questionnaire are presented in Table 3.2.

Leadership Styles

Tables 4.33 and 4.34 show the number of women who scored high or low on the two dimensions, Consideration and Structure, of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire. The fact that more than half of the middle-management and almost half of the upper-management women officers scored high on both dimensions was significant. Fleishman (1969) pointed out that a high ranking on both the dimensions of Consideration and Structure seemed to be optimum. He related several studies that pointed up "that productivity and morale were higher in groups with supervisors emphasizing both patterns" (Fleishman, 1969, p. 8).

Table 4.35 reports how the women ranked when the scores are viewed in combinations. The data presented here indicated that few of these women student personnel administrators, when studied from the perspective of leadership styles, were low on both leadership

TABLE 4.33--Scores on the Consideration dimension of the Leader-
ship Opinion Questionnaire

Scores	Upper-management		Middle-management	
	f	%	f	%
High (56-80)	56	73.7	32	80.0
Low (1-55)	20	26.3	8	20.0
Total	76	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE 4.34--Scores on the Structure dimension of the Leadership
Opinion Questionnaire

Scores	Upper-management		Middle-management	
	f	%	f	%
High (49-80)	42	55.3	23	57.5
Low (1-48)	34	44.7	17	42.5
Total	76	100.0	40	100.0

TABLE 4.35--Combined ranking of the dimensions of Consideration
and Structure

Combined Ranking	Upper-management		Middle-management	
	f	%	f	%
High Consideration-High Structure	35	46.2	23	57.5
High Consideration-Low Structure	31	40.7	15	37.5
Low Consideration-High Structure	9	11.8	1	2.5
Low Consideration-Low Structure	1	1.3	1	2.5
Total	76	100.0	40	100.0

dimensions of Consideration and Structure. Only 1.3 percent of the upper-management officers and 2.5 percent of the middle-management officers were classified as low on both dimensions. The mean scores used as normative data are based on a study of hospital administrators (Fleishman, 1969).

There was no significant difference (at the .05 level) between means of upper-management and middle-management women student personnel officers on either Leadership Opinion Questionnaire dimension (see Table 4.36). In other words, the responses to the LOQ were similar.

Other Relationships

In order to determine if there were other characteristics unique to either of the management groups, a chi-square (X^2) analysis was used to determine if there was a relationship between each biographical variable and a high-low Consideration score and high-low Structure score. These results are presented in Table 4.37.

The relationship between the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire
dimension of Consideration and selected variables

Fleishman's (1969) dimension Consideration is defined as reflecting

the extent to which an individual is likely to have job
relationships with his subordinates characterized by

mutual trust, respect for their ideas, consideration of their feelings, and a certain warmth between himself and them (p. 1).

It may be observed in Table 4.37 that there was no significant relationship between a high or low score on the Consideration dimension and selected personal characteristic variables of upper-management and middle-management student personnel officers.

The exception was the variable on marital status. Fewer married women (12.8 percent) scored low on the Consideration dimension whereas 29.9 percent of those classified as single ranked low on Consideration. The other variable that comes close to any real significance (at the .1 level) was that labeled "Level Mother Employed." If the respondent's mother was employed at the pro-fessional-managerial end of the scale, the subject was more likely to score high on Consideration.

The results of the analysis of selected professional charac-teristics and the dimension Consideration are shown in Table 4.38. Only one of the seven variables contributed significantly to the prediction of a high Consideration score.

If a woman student personnel officer was pursuing an advanced degree at the doctoral level, she was more likely to score high on the Consideration dimension. This might be traced to the fact that these women were going on for advanced training in human relations skills--namely counseling and personnel.

TABLE 4.36--Leadership Opinion Questionnaire-Consideration and Leadership Opinion Questionnaire-Structure dimension means and standard deviations for upper-management and middle-management women student personnel officers

Dimension	Upper-management			Middle-management		
	N	$\overline{X}$	SD	N	$\overline{X}$	SD
Consideration	76	59.70	5.899	40	59.93	6.044
Structure	76	43.17	7.721	40	44.50	7.494

TABLE 4.37--A comparison of relationships between high-low scores on the Consideration dimension and selected personal characteristic variables

Variables	df	Chi Square Values
Age	3	1.453
Marital status	1	4.110*
Number of children	2	.0578
Number of siblings	8	3.221
Oldest child	1	.029
Oldest female child	1	.021
Youngest child	1	.009
Mother employed	1	.422
Level of mother's employment	3	6.267
Level of father's employment	3	3.389
Feminist	1	1.664

*significant at p$\angle$.05

TABLE 4.38--Professional characteristics and their relationship to high-low scores on the Consideration dimension

Variable	df	Chi Square Value
Size of university	3	3.200
Salary	3	.098
Degree	2	2.221
Pursuing degree	1	.021
Which degree pursued?	2	6.659*
Published	1	2.657
Active in professional organization	1	.062

*significant at pL..05

The relationship between Leadership Opinion Questionnaire dimension Structure and selected variables

The dimension Structure is defined by Fleishman as reflecting

. . . the extent to which an individual is likely to define and structure his own role and those of his subordinates toward goal attainment (p. 1).

The chi square values reported in Table 4.39 demonstrated that little relationship existed between a high or low score on the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire's Structure dimension and selected personal characteristics of women student personnel administrators. There was one exception to this lack of significance. The woman student personnel officer who was the oldest female child tended to score higher on the Structure dimension of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire and first-born children scored very high on the Structure dimension. The obtained chi square value recorded was 3.22,

and the X^2 of 3.84 is significant at the .05 level.

When comparing Structure scores with the professional characteristics of the respondents, again little statistical significance (.05 level) was found (see Table 4.40).

TABLE 4.39--Relationship between high-low Structure scores and selected personal characteristics

Variable	df	Chi Square Value
Age	3	2.662
Marital status	1	.114
Number of children	2	1.801
Number of siblings	8	12.926
Oldest child	1	3.221
Oldest female child	1	4.201*
Youngest child	1	1.030
Mother employed	1	.539
Level of mother's employment	3	5.766
Level of father's employment	3	2.709
Feminist	1	.009

*significant at pL .05

TABLE 4.40--Relationship between high-low Structure scores and selected professional characteristics

Variable	df	Chi Square Value*
Size of university	3	3.426
Salary	3	1.730
Degree	2	.047
Which degree pursued?	2	2.101
Published	1	.320
Active in professional organizations	1	.314

*none are significant at pL .05

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to compare biographical data and leadership styles of women student personnel administrators who were employed at the university level. To accomplish this, four steps were taken. First, leadership behavior studies and research on women leaders were outlined to trace major trends in these areas. Second, 150 female student personnel administrators were randomly selected from a university population of women student personnel officers. These women were all members of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors (NAWDAC). Third, pertinent biographical data and the leadership style of upper-management and middle-management female student personnel officers were gathered. Fourth, a comparison was made between these two groups of women to see whether there were differences in their backgrounds and behaviors.

Books and articles were examined in order to produce a comprehensive summary of leadership behavioral studies as well as to provide a comprehensive statement of women as professional leaders. These studies and articles indicated that leadership

101

theories have emerged from simple explanations of observable behavior to sophisticated analysis of complex relationships. For example, early research tried to delineate specific traits of leaders which would distinguish them from others. When the findings from trait research could not be adequately supported, behavioralists moved to the situational approach. The situational approach concluded that a leader's abilities, aptitudes and background tended to be related to those goals set by the group. However, it soon became further evident to some researchers that the situation could become the determinant of successful leadership behavior. Obviously, such a conclusion called for an assessment of the situation in order that a certain type of person could be identified as leader.

A situational assessment brought researchers back to the study of the leader himself. As a result, a leader's behavior was measured so that it characterized the leader's method of interacting with subordinates. In other words, certain behavioral characteristics of a leader are needed in specific situations.

In tracing the past development of women professionals and, more particularly, women student personnel administrators, it was found that little attention had been given the highly trained and educated woman beyond superficial investigations.

Despite some impressive gains, the overall employment

picture for professional women has declined (WEAL, 1972). The literature has explained such a decline in several ways: occupational sex-typing of certain professions, sex-typed career choice counseling, career commitments, sex discrimination, and female career disruptions.

There were few studies which dealt specifically with women student personnel administrators. Several studies, however, related more closely to the personal characteristics of women in student personnel administration. Female student personnel officers tended to be older than their male counterparts (Cheatham, 1964; Ayer, et al., 1966; and Hester, 1971); were less mobile than males in student personnel work (Sherburne, 1968); the majority of the women in student personnel posts had a master's degree (Berry and Fitzgerald, 1971); and few were in top level student personnel positions (Berry and Fitzgerald, 1971).

The average woman student personnel administrator in the sample for this study was forty years old and employed by a large university (10,000 or more). She was unmarried, the recipient of a master's degree and was earning about $11,000. Only one woman in the sample was in a top-level administrative post, as vice-president for student affairs.

The second step in this study was the selection and sampling of the women student personnel officers. The aim was to choose

a random sample of women which would be representative of the women in student personnel work at the university level. The women were drawn from the 1973 membership list of NAWDAC. (A majority of the NAWDAC members are in student personnel work.) There was a total of 476 women student personnel officers. The sample consisted of 150 women chosen so as to fairly represent the total group.

The third step in developing this study was to gather pertinent biographical data and information on leadership styles for each woman in the sample. Data were collected by mailed questionnaires. Two questionnaires were sent to each person: the Biographical Questionnaire and the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire.

One aspect of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire that should be explored was the discontentment registered by some of the respondents. Many of the women consistently avoided answering some of the questions. To account for these omissions, Fleishman recommended that an average score of the items completed be determined and these added to the total for that scale.

Three of the respondents took the time to type a letter expressing their frustrations about the questionnaire. Others placed question marks and/or comments beside the questions that displeased or troubled them. The focus of this displeasure seemed to be the feeling on the part of some of these administrators that

Fleishman was manipulating the answers by his selection choices and that the answers were ambiguous.

The fourth step was a three-phase analysis of the data. A brief description of the sample was given, relationships between variables and leadership style were described, and relationships between variables and level of leadership were coded.

Seven research questions were posed for comparison. Discussion of the comparative findings has been organized around these seven questions.

1. Do leadership styles of women student personnel administrators vary with job level?

About half of the upper-management and about an equal number of the middle-management women scored relatively high on both dimensions of the LOQ. In the various studies cited by Fleishman, a high score on each of the dimensions Consideration and Structure is an optimum situation. Fleishman (1969) pointed out that "productivity and morale were higher in groups with supervisors emphasizing both patterns (p. 8)."

On the opposite end of the continuum there were very few women at either job level who scored low on both Consideration and Structure. In fact, only one woman from each group ranked low on both dimensions.

The results of the scores on the LOQ produced a mean on the Consideration dimension of 59.70 for the upper-management women and 59.93 for the middle-management women. The means for the Structure dimension were 43.17 and 44.50 respectively. Compared to sixty-eight male executives (Fleishman, 1969), the mean scores of 59.70 and 59.93 of the women student personnel administrators were higher on the Consideration dimension than the mean score of 55.3 for the male executives. However, the male executives scored considerably higher on the Structure dimension. Upper-management women had a mean score of 43.17 and the middle-management women had a mean score of 44.50, while the male executives' score was 50.6.

There was no significant difference between means of upper-management and middle-management women's scores on either dimension. Therefore, it was concluded that the leadership styles of women student personnel administrators do not differ by job level. However, when compared to male executives, the women scored higher on Consideration and the men on Structure.

2. Are these leadership styles consistent with the ones found in the literature?

Much of the research being done today in the area of leadership theory is specifically focused on the behavioral characteristics

of effective leaders. Although the past research on leadership traits has not been substantiated, it seems clear that leaders do behave differently from other group members.

Campbell (1956), Fiedler (1967), Hemphill (1961), Stogdill (1956), as well as Fleishman (1969), are only a few of the many who have found effective means of measuring a leader's method or methods of interacting with those in subordinate positions. Each of these men have concluded that there are definite patterns of leadership styles of interaction and that such styles can be measured. However, the research cautions that the situation does have an influence on which style will be successful.

In order to determine the accuracy of a leader's style in a given situation, Fleishman (1969) devised a parallel questionnaire, "The Supervisory Behavior Description." The correlations between the LOQ and The Supervisory Behavior Description "confirm that the dimension of Consideration and Structure relate to independent group performance measures (Fleishman, 1969, p. 8)."

A large percentage of the respondents in this study, it was noted, had behavioral characteristics of effective leaders as defined by the literature. Fifty percent of the women scored high on both leadership dimensions which, according to Fleishman, was an optimum combination.

3. Have upper-management women administrators had more training or education than those in middle-management?

The master's degree was the typical one held by both upper-management and middle-management women student personnel officers. The earned doctorate had been received by one-fourth of upper-management and one-third of the middle-management officers. The middle-management group was slightly ahead in the earned doctorate arena. A rather small number in each group held only a bachelor's degree and none of the population had less than a college degree. The upper-management group, however, had a larger percentage of women at the bachelor's level than the middle-management group.

Of equal significance was the fact that more middle-management women were currently enrolled in a doctoral or master's program than their counterparts. The majority of the women in both groups who were pursuing advanced degrees had recorded counseling and personnel as their major program.

In other studies of women student personnel officers, the results were similar. For example, in their survey, Berry and Fitzgerald (1971) reported that of the women student personnel officers who responded, fourteen percent held doctorates and seventy-four percent a master's degree. Ayer, Russell and Tripp (1966) showed in their study that more than two-thirds of the deans

of women in their sample had a master's degree while only one-sixth held a doctorate and an equal number a bachelor's or less.

Stevenson's (1972) results, on the other hand, were somewhat different. She found that seventy-nine percent of the women administrators in Big Ten universities held an earned doctorate and the rest had a master's degree.

It was concluded that the upper-management women in this study did not have more education or training than the middle-management group. However, more middle-management women administrators were pursuing a doctoral degree than those in upper-management.

4. Are women who achieve upper level administrative posts unmarried or childless?

The largest proportion of both groups of women student personnel officers in this sample were unmarried. When the divorced and widowed respondents were added to the single category, it was found that about two-thirds of each management level were unmarried. Of those women in each group who were married, about half had no children. The average number of children for married student personnel officers was 1.2.

In her study of female business executives, Hennig (1971) found that none of the married executives had children. Watley

(1969), in his research on able young women, pointed out that of those who were married almost fifty percent reported having no children.

In an effort to determine career patterns of women administrators in higher education, Gardner (1966) sent questionnaires to women administrators in Illinois; one of her conclusions was that single women attained administrative posts more easily than married women.

The data in this study suggested that being single and/or childless was an advantage to women in student personnel services.

5. Do upper-management student personnel administrators have family backgrounds similar to middle-management administrators?

The great majority of the women in the sample population were only children or had only one sibling. Very few of the women in either management group came from families of four or more children.

Of those administrators who had siblings, more than half in each management group were the oldest child. Even more significant was the fact that about three-fourths of the women in each group reported themselves as the oldest female child.

Several researchers have found that successful people are often first born or only children. This finding holds true for

successful women. Toman (1970) stated it succinctly when he said, "oldest children will inevitably learn to be leaders (p. 68)."

In her extensive research on the woman executive, Hennig (1971) bore out the fact that the successful woman executive tended to be a first born. All fifty of the women she studied were either the only child or the first born in an all girl family.

Many studies ascertained that successful women had close relationship with their fathers (Hennig, 1971; Macahy, 1963). Career patterns of successful women were found to be influenced also by mothers. There tended to be a strong association between maternal employment and daughters' career (Almquist and Angrist, 1971, Fogarty et al., 1971; and Astin, 1967). It is interesting to note that in this study a large proportion of women at each management level felt their mothers had the greatest influence on them.

The majority of the mothers of the women in this sample were not employed while the respondents were children. Of the upper-management mothers who were employed, the majority worked at the professional or managerial level, whereas only thirty percent of the middle-management mothers were employed at either of these levels.

Most of the fathers of both groups of women were employed at the professional or managerial levels. In fact, the largest number of fathers were recorded as professionals.

In conclusion, in this study women student personnel administrators tended to be only children or oldest children who felt their mothers had the greater influence on them.

6. Are upper-management women administrators more mobile than middle-management women administrators?

In a study of mobility, Sherburne (1968) found that males tended to be more mobile than females within any given level of a student personnel organization, even if females were as well or better qualified for upward mobility. Stevenson (1972), in her study of women administrators, pointed out that eighty-nine percent of the women held previous administrative positions and of these, eighty-four percent moved up within the institutions for which they presently worked.

The vast majority of the women included in the sample for this study held previous jobs in institutions of higher education. In fact, three-fourths of the middle-management and over four-fifths of the upper-management women were experientially trained in educational ranks.

A significant number of the women in both management groups had held several professional positions prior to their present position. However, the majority of the women who had been classified as middle-management had had more jobs in the past than the

upper-management women. Nearly half of the upper-management group had had three other positions prior to their present position, whereas almost two-thirds of the middle-management group held three to five jobs.

The majority of the women in both groups were in administrative positions before coming to their present job. The middle-management women held these previous positions for a shorter period of time. About forty-six percent of them were in their previous jobs two years or less. The upper-management women exhibited two extremes. About a fourth of them had been in their previous positions only one year, whereas another fourth had held their previous jobs six or more years.

Middle-management women in student personnel administration apparently move from one job to another more frequently than women in upper-management.

7. What variables do affect the responses of women student personnel administrators in either upper-management or middle-management?

    A. Age - The women in both management groups were rather evenly distributed by age. There does appear, however, to be a slight skew in the direction of youth for the middle-management group. The average age for upper-management was 41.2 and 36.4 for the middle-management group.

Berry and Fitzgerald (1971), in a survey of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, reported that forty-six percent of the responding membership was over forty-five years old, while twenty-five percent were under thirty years old.

Stevenson's (1972) results are similar to that gathered by Berry and Fitzgerald. She found that the greatest number of women at the higher levels of administration were in the forty-five to fifty-four year old bracket.

In an earlier study, Ayers, Tripp and Russell (1966) recorded that more than fifty-one percent of the women chief student personnel officers were in the fifty-plus group.

The present study indicated younger ages, especially for upper-management women, than those cited in earlier studies. Middle-management women, too, tended to be younger than those found in other studies.

B. Professional memberships and leadership - A majority of the sample for this study had elected membership in at least two professional organizations other than NAWDAC. The upper-management women were slightly more involved professionally as nearly three-fourths of them held at least two other professional memberships besides NAWDAC.

More than half of the women in each group had held an office in one or more professional organizations in the past five years.

Ayers, Tripp and Russell (1966) reported that "more than a quarter of the sample population belong to no organizations related to their professional work (p. 15)." However, they further recorded that deans of women had a greater tendency to be associated with professional organizations than their male counterparts.

Ayers, et al. (1966), found also that the main thrust of interest was appropriately enough indicated by membership in the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors. The American Personnel and Guidance Association was a distant second in order of participation (Ayers et al., p. 30).

While Ayers, Tripp and Russell(1966) reported only five percent of the women deans as members of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, the present study found that 19.4 percent of the upper-management and 24.5 percent of the middle-management women indicated membership in this organization.

Therefore, the women in this sample were more involved in professional organizations than those women

cited in the Ayers study.

C. Size of the university - About half of the women in the
population sample were employed by institutions with
enrollments of 10,000 and over. The upper-management
women were somewhat more evenly distributed by
university size than those in the middle-management
group. The latter group tended to be clustered in the
larger universities.

   The data for the present study concludes that the size
of the employing institution was not a determinant of
management level.

D. Publications - A larger percentage of the women in upper-
management had published in the last five years than those
in middle-management. However, the fact that a little
over two-thirds of the former group and almost three-
fourths of the latter had not published must be taken into
consideration. Articles and monographs were the most
widely recorded publications. None of the women had
authored a book.

   In conclusion, the majority of the women in the sample
for this study had not published in the past five years.
There was no difference in the publishing record between
the two management groups.

E. Feminist affiliation - Among those women who reported

affiliation with a feminist group, the upper-management

women were rather evenly split. The middle-management

officers were definitely skewed toward feminist involve-

ment. Sixty-one percent of the latter group had affiliated

with a feminist group, whereas less than half (49.4 percent)

of the upper-management women were active feminists.

Younger women (20-40 years old) were found to be

significantly more involved in feminist organizations than

women in the forty-one plus age bracket.

In conclusion, upper-management women were somewhat

less involved in feminist groups than middle-management

women, and women in the twenty to forty age bracket were

significantly more involved than women who were forty-one

and older.

As a result of further statistical analysis, the data from the

Biographical Questionnaire and the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire

suggested that there were differences among women student personnel

administrators. Eight of these observations reached statistical

significance:

1. Upper-management women were receiving higher salaries;

2. More middle-management student personnel officers were

pursuing advanced degrees;

3. A large majority of the women who had affiliated with a feminist group were in the twenty to forty age category;

4. The majority of the women in both groups rated themselves as middle-management;

5. Women who were married scored higher on the Consideration dimension of the LOQ;

6. Administrators whose mothers were employed at the professional and/or managerial levels scored higher on the Consideration dimension of the LOQ;

7. Women who were pursuing doctoral degrees scored higher on the Consideration dimension of the LOQ.

8. Oldest children and oldest female children scored higher on the Structure dimension of the LOQ.

The first two observations were assumed and further served to verify the classifications of the two management groups. It would seem obvious that upper-management women would be earning more and that middle-management women would be more involved in advanced training and education.

However, the last six observations focus more closely on variables which might be more definitive of leadership characteristics. For example, married women scored consistently higher on the Consideration dimension of the LOQ. Findings such as the above, although not definitive, were statistically significant in this study

and should be further researched and developed.

Concluding Remarks

The focus of the dissertation was to gather and analyze data about women student personnel administrators. After analyzing the responses of the women managers in this study and relating these responses to questions about women in administration, an underlying link between women, marriage and careers was apparent. Since this dissertation was about professional women in student personnel administration, and although the role conflict problem was not the focus of the study, there were still some evident implications. For example, in these data three career contingencies seemed to be operating. First, there was the pressure for a full-time, uninterrupted career; second, the pressures of child bearing and family development seemed evident; and third, there was the problem of entering a career area that is populated and to a degree dominated by men.

An indication of the conflict in the first two roles or career choices may be inferred from the fact that almost fifty-one percent of the women in this study had never been married, 9.3 percent were divorced, and about six percent were widowed. If these figures are totaled, two-thirds of all the women included in the study were unmarried. This implies that marriage and student personnel

administration careers may not be compatible. Further support for this implication may be the relation between the mean age of the women, which was 39.7, and mean years of marriage, which was 6.5.

Another career contingency or conflict is child bearing and family development, which also seemed to be operating against full involvement of these women in student personnel administration. Of the fifty-seven women who were married, divorced, or widowed, twenty-nine had children. Of the total sample, less than one-fourth of the women had children and then the average number of children was only 1.2. If the mean age of the women and the mean years of marriage are considered, the possibility that some of the children were stepchildren becomes a further consideration. Thus, the data suggested that child bearing and student personnel administration was also not a viable combination.

The third underlying assumption was the apparent male dominance in the student personnel field. For example, only one woman in the study obtained a top-level position as vice-president for student affairs. Twenty-two percent of the women in middle-management reported the title of dean of a student personnel service. However, none of the women had total responsibility for developing policies, procedures and programs. Also twelve of the women had dual titles. Many had the title associate dean of students and also

the title dean of women. The dean of students was inevitably a male.

The aforementioned career contingencies or conflicts may well have been operating and may well be a deterrent to some women who might otherwise be in student personnel administration. Marriage and child bearing have been a significant aspect of the female role in our society and must be considered in relation to career development. The prescribed occupational roles, family roles and career roles apparently continue to create contingencies which do not easily allow women, and especially married women, to make the choice to pursue an administrative career in student personnel. None of these career contingencies were purposely determined by this study. Thus, these implications need to be tested with further research.

Suggestions for Further Study

In retrospect, in considering the procedures and results of this study, it was felt that by and large the procedures used and the results obtained were satisfactory for a preliminary study. Use of the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire and the Biographical Data Question were efficient means of gathering data. Perhaps some additional demographic information related to career and marital roles would have been desirable.

After an assessment of the data, however, several directions

for further study in the area of women student personnel administration seemed warranted. The data for the formulation of the dissertation was based on limited information about the women administrators. Hence, probable refinements in the findings will emerge as data from other studies and samples become available. In order to facilitate such new data, several suggestions for further study can be recommended. Among these are:

1. The processes by which women student personnel administrators selected their professions and then became committed to them needs to be explored. Most women are confronted with the choice of the importance of marriage versus career. Two-thirds of the women managers responding to the questionnaires for this study were not married. Therefore, further research is needed to determine how the women in student personnel administration chose a career in this field and how such a choice was determined. A matched sample of women in another career area could be employed to determine any affects of career conflict on both groups.

2. The study revealed few differences between middle-management and upper-management women student personnel administrators. Therefore, a matched study of student personnel administrators and other career women could be conducted in an attempt to confirm the findings of this study.

3. Because the evidence showed little difference in biographical background and leadership styles of upper-management and middle-management women student personnel officers, a comparable study could be pursued with a matched, all-male sample of student personnel administrators to determine and compare differences between male and female middle-management and upper-management student personnel administrators.

REFERENCES

Abelson, P. H. Women in Academia. *Science*, CLXXV, 1972.

Acheson, E. M. *The Effective Dean of Women.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1932.

Adams, A. S. The Role of the Dean of Women on the College Campus. *NAWDC Journal*, XXVI (October 1962), 20-23.

Almquist, E. M. and Angrist, S. S. Role Model Influences on College Women's Career Aspirations. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, No. 3, XVII (July 1971).

Arter, M. H. The Role of Women in Administration in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. Unpublished dissertation, Arizona State University, 1972.

Astin, H. S. Factors Associated with Participation of Women Doctorates in the Labor Force. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, IVL, No. 3 (1967), 240-246.

Ayers, A. R., Tripp, P. A., and Russell, J. H. *Student Services Administration in Higher Education.* Washington, D. C.: Office of Education, HEW, 1966.

Bachtold, L. M. and Werner, E. E. Personality Profiles of Gifted Women. *The American Psychologist*, XXV (March 1970), 234-243.

Baker, E. F. *Technology and Woman's Work.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1964.

Bass, B. M. Leadership Opinions Forecasts of Supervisory Success: A Replication. In Fleishman, *Manual for Leadership Opinion Questionnaire*, 1969.

Basil, D. C. *Women in Management.* New York: Dunellen, 1972.

Bavelas, A. Leadership: Man and Function. In Frey and Getschman (eds.), *School Administrator: Selected Readings.* New York: Crowell, 1968, 255-261.

Bavelas, A., Hastorf, A. H., Gross, A. E., and Kite, W. C. Experiments on the Alteration of Group Structure, _Journal of Experimental Social Psychology_, I (1965), 55-70.

Bennis, W. G. Leadership Theory and Administrative Behavior: The Problem of Authority, _Administrative Quarterly_, IV (1959), 259-301.

Bird, C. _Born Female: The High Cost of Keeping Women Down._ New York: David McKay, 1968.

Bernard, J. _Academic Women._ University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1964.

Berry, M. C. and Fitzgerald, L. E. Profile and Status of NAWDC Members. _NAWDC Journal_, XXXIV (Winter 1971), 50-59.

Boles, H. Class notes. Spring 1973.

Buchannan, E. H. Women in Management. _Personnel Administration._ XXXII, No. 5 (September-October 1969), 21-26.

Bunting, M. As quoted in _Time_, November 3, 1961, p. 68.

Burns, D. M. Women in Educational Administration: A Study of Leadership in California Public Schools, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1964. (University Microfilms Publications No. 64-12, 150)

Cabotaji, A. A. A Comparative Study of the Qualifications for Deans of Women in Institutions of Higher Education in the U. S. and in the Republic of the Philippines. _Dissertation Abstracts_, 1963, 23, 3185.

Campbell, D. F. _Leadership and Its Effects Upon the Group,_ Research Monograph. LXXXIII. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Bureau of Business Research, 1956.

Carroll, M. A. Women in Administration in Higher Education. _Contemporary Education_, XLIII, No. 4 (February 1972), 214-218.

Carter, L. F. Leadership and Small Group Behavior. In M. Sherif and M. O. Wilson (eds.), _Group Relations at the Crossroads_, New York: Harper, 1953.

Carter, L. F. and Nixon, M. Ability, Perceptual Personality and Interest Factors Associated with Different Criteria of Leadership. Journal of Psychology, XXVII (1949), 377-388.

Cheatham, A. L. S. Student Personnel Work as a Career: A Study of Members of the American College Personnel Association in Terms of Selected Demographic Data, Background Factors and Perceptions of the Field. Dissertation Abstracts, 1964, 25, 5042.

_____. Christian Science Monitor. Women and Higher Education. Editorial. January 31, 1972.

Cless, E. L. A Modest Proposal for the Educating of Women. The American Scholar (Fall 1968) 618.

Cohen, A. C. Women and Higher Education: Recommendations for Change. Phi Delta Kappan, LIII, No. 3 (November 1971), 164-167.

Cowley, W. H. Three Distinctions in the Study of Leaders. The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, XXIII (July-September 1928), 144-147.

Crass, K. P. College Women: A Research Description. NAWDC Journal, XXXII (Fall 1968), 12-21.

Crawley, J., Levitin, T. and Quinn, R. Seven Deadly Half Truths About Women. Psychology Today, VI (March 1973), 96.

Cummings, L. L. The Manager as a Leader. Educational Administration: Selected Readings. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971, 184-192.

Cunningham, R. M., Jr. Women Who Made It Offer Insights into Their Problems. College and University Business, IIL (February 1970), 60.

Cussler, M. The Woman Executive. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1958.

Doll, P. A. A Comparative Study of Top Level Male and Female Executives in Harris County. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Houston, 1965. (University Microfilms No. 66-5377)

Dutton, T. B. (chairman) An Exploratory Investigation of Selected Assumptions and Beliefs of Student Personnel Administrators: A Preliminary Report. NASPA Journal, V, No. 4 (April 1968).

Epstein, C. F. Women's Place. Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1970.

Farnsworth, D. L. Personality Problems for Deans. NAWDC Journal, XXII, No. 4(June 1959), 178-183.

Feder, D. D. The Emerging Role of the Professional Personnel Worker. Chapter VIII, Personnel Services in Education, 58th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959, 181-209.

Ferrari, M. R. National Study of Student Personnel Manpower Planning--1972. NASPA Journal, X (October 1972), 91-100.

Fiedler, T. E. A Theory of Leadership Effectiveness. New York: McGraw Hill, 1967.

Fleishman, E. A. Manual for Leadership Opinion Questionnaire, Chicago: SRA, Inc., 1969.

Fleishman, E. A., Harris, E. F., and Burtt, H. E. Leadership and Supervision Industry. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1955.

Fleishman, E. A., and Ko, I. Leadership Patterns Associated with Managerial Evaluations of Effectiveness. In Manual for Leadership Opinion Questionnaire, 1969.

Fogarty, M. P., Rapaport, R., and Rapaport, R. N. Sex, Career and Family. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1971.

Foy, J. E. V. Career Patterns of Student Personnel Administrators. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1969.

Freidan, B., and West, A. Sex Bias: The Built in Mentality that Maims the Public Schools. American School Board Journal, CLIX (October 1971), 16-20.

Gardner, H. R. Women Administrators in Higher Education in Illinois: A Study of Current Career Patterns. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1966. (University Microfilms Publication No. 66-12, 655)

Gibb, C. A. Leadership. In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (eds.)
The Handbook of Social Psychology. New York: Addison,
1969.

Good, C. V. Essentials of Educational Research. New York:
Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1966.

Graham, P. A. Women in Academia. Science, CLXIX (September
1970), 1284-1290.

Greenleaf, E. Who Should Educate the College Student Personnel
Worker and to What End? Journal of the Association of Deans
and Administrators of Student Affairs, VI, No. 1 (July 1968),
29-32.

Gruchow, N. Discrimination: Women Charge Universities, Colleges
with Bias. Science (May 1970), 559.

Grusky, O. Career Mobility and Organizational Commitment. In
Glasser (ed.), Organizational Careers. Chicago: Aldine
Publishing Co., 1968.

Haller, L. M. The Future Role of the Highest Ranking Women
Student Personnel Administrator in the College or University
and a Suggested Training Program. Unpublished doctoral
dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.

Halpin, A. W. The Leadership Behavior and Leadership Ideology of
Educational Administrators and Aircraft Commanders.
Harvard Educational Review, XXV (Winter 1955), 18-32.

Hare, A., Borgatta, Baler, R. F. (eds.). Small Group: Studies
in Social Interaction. 2nd edition. New York: Knopf, 1955.

Hemphill, J. K. Situational Factors in Leadership. Bureau of
Educational Research, Monograph 32. Columbus: Ohio State
University, 1949.

Hemphill, J. K. Leader Behavior Description. Personnel Research
Board. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1950.

Hemphill, J. K. A Proposed Theory of Leadership in Small Groups,
Second Preliminary Report, Personnel Research Board, Ohio
State University, 1954.

Hemphill, J. K. Why People Attempt to Lead. In L. Petruelo and B. M. Bass (eds.). Leadership and Interpersonal Behavior. Boston: Holt, 1961.

Hennig, M. What Happens on the Way Up? The MBA/Masters in Business Administration, March, 1971.

Hennig, M. Quoted in Christian Science Monitor, January 31, 1972.

Hester, L. H. Differential Perception of Factors Important in the Selection of Student Personnel Administrators in Midwestern Universities. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1971.

Hoyt, D. P., and Tripp, P. A. Characteristics of ACPA Members. The Journal of College Student Personnel, No. I (1967), i.

Jaynes, W. E. Differences Between Jobs and Between Organizations. Patterns of Administrative Performance. Research Monograph 81, Bureau of Business Research, Columbus: Ohio State University, 1956.

Jenkins, W. O. A Review of Leadership Studies with Particular Reference to Military Problems. Psychological Bulletin, VIL, No. 1 (1947), 75.

Jennings, E. Routes to the Executive Suite. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1971.

Jennings, H. H. Leadership and Isolation: A Study of Personality in Inter-personal Relations. 2nd edition. New York: Langmans, 1950.

Kaufman, H. The Status of Women in Administration in Selected Institutions of Higher Education in the United States. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1961.

Katz, D., and Kahn, R. The Social Psychology of Organization. New York: Wiley, 1966.

Koenig, W. L. The Dean of Women: Ideal and Actual Perceptions of Role. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1964.

Lane, W. R. Foundations of Educational Administration--A Behavioral Analysis. New York: MacMillan, 1966.

Leavitt, H. J. Some Effects of Certain Communication Patterns on Group Performance. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, VIL (1951), 38-50.

Lee, W. S. God Bless Our Queer Old Dean. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1959.

Leslie, L. L. Increasing Response Rates to Long Questionnaires. The Journal of Educational Research, LXIII (1970), 345-350.

Levin, K., Lippit, R., and White, R. K. Patterns of Aggressive Behavior in Experimentally Created "Social Climates." Journal of Social Psychology, X (1939), 271-299.

Lewis, E. C. Developing Woman's Potential. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University, 1961.

Lippitt, G. L. What Do We Know About Leadership. National Education Association Journal, VIL (December 1955), 556-557.

Lippitt, R. and White, R. K. The "Social Climate" of Children's Groups. In R. G. Baker, J. S. Kaunin, and H. F. Wright (eds.) Child Behavior and Development. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, 1947.

Loring, R. and Wells, T. Breakthrough: Women into Management. New York: Van Nostrand Reinbald Co., 1972.

Macaby, E. Woman's Intellect. In S. M. Tarber and R. H. L. Wilson (eds.). The Potential of Women. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1963.

_____. Companies Theories About Women Executives, Management Methods, XIII, No. 3 (December 1957), 14-16.

Mann, R. D. A Review of the Relationship Between Personality and Performance in Small Groups. Psychological Bulletin, LVI (1959), 241-270.

Marsink, H. M. Leader Behavior of Men and Women Secondary School Principals. Educational Horizons, IIIL, No. 2 (Winter 1968-69), 67-74.

Matfield, J. A. Many are Called, But Few are Chosen. Speech presented to American Council on Education. October, 1972.

Matthews, L. K. The Dean of Women. New York: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1915.

McBee, M. L. The Role of the Dean of Women in Selected Institutions of Higher Learning. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1961.

McGannon, J., Barry, S. J. Tooling Up in the Talent Pool: A Proposal for Regional Administrative Internship Programs for Women. Speech given to American Council on Education, October, 1972.

McVey, F. L. and Hughes, R. M. Problems of College and University Administration. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State College Press, 1952.

Mead, M. and Kaplan, F. B. (eds.). American Women. New York: Scribner, 1965.

Meyers, E. M. and Sandlin, A. Survey of Minority and Women Student Affairs Staff Members Employed in NASPA Member Institutions. NASPA Journal, XI, No. 1 (July 1973), 2-14.

Mueller, K. H. Educating Women for a Changing World. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954.

Mueller, K. H. Student Personnel Work in Higher Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.

Mueller, L. C. and Muller, O. G. (eds.). New Horizons for College Women. Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press, 1960.

Murray, P. Economic and Educational Inequality Based on Sex: An Overview. Valparaiso University Law Review, V (1971), 255-257.

National Education Association, National Council of Administrative Women in Education. Wanted--More Women in Educational Leadership, Washington, D. C., 1965.

Newcomer, M. A Century of Higher Education for American Women. New York: Harper and Brothers Publisher, 1959.

Oltman, R. M. Campus 1970: Where Do Women Stand? Research Report of a Survey on Women in Academe. Washington, D. C.: American Association of University Women, 1970.

Paine, L. T. A Survey of Current Personnel Practices in Selected Colleges and Universities as Related to the Functions of the Office of the Dean of Women. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Cornell University, 1949.

Parker, T. C. Relationships Among Measures of Supervisory Behavior, Group Behavior, and Situational Characteristics. Personnel Psychology, XVI (1963), 319-334.

Pifer, A. Quoted in Guidepost, published by APGA, February 11, 1974, 16, 10, 4.

Pifer, A. Quoted in Christian Science Monitor, January 31, 1972.

Preston, M. G. and Heintz, R. K. Effects of Participatory vs. Supervisory Leadership on Group Judgment. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, VIL (1949), 345-355.

Ramseyer, J. A., Harris, L. A., Land, M. Z., and Wakefield, H. Educational Administration. The School--Community Development Study, Monograph 2. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1955.

Reeves, M. E. and Arbuckle, D. S. The Counseling Attitudes of Deans of Women. The Personnel and Guidance Journal, XLI (January 1963), 438-441.

Rim, Y. Leadership Attitudes and Decisions Involving Risk. Personnel Psychology, XVIII (1965), 423-430.

Robin, S. S. A Procedure for Securing Returns to Mail Questionnairs. Social and Sociological Research, L (1965), 24-35.

Rossi, A. S. Equality Between the Sexes. Daedalus (Spring 1964), 623.

Rostow, E. G. Conflicts and Accomodation. Daedalus (Spring 1964), 748.

Sandler, B. Women and Higher Education: Where Do We Go From Here? Address to Wingspread Conference on Women in Higher Education, Racine, Wisconsin, March, 1972.

Schmidt, M. R. Personality Change in College Women. Journal of College Student Personnel, XI (1970), 414-418.

Schorter, S. The Psychology of Affiliation. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1965.

Schowalter, E. Women and the Literary Curriculum. College English. XXXII (1971), 855-861.

Shelden, M.A. Contemporary Challenge of Traditional Concepts. Journal of the Association of Deans and Administrators of Student Affairs, VI, No. 1 (July 1968), 3-9.

Sherburne, P.R. Rates and Patterns of Mobility of Student Personnel Administrators. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1968.

Siegel, A.E. Education of Women at Stanford University. In The Study of Education at Stanford. Report to the University Graduate Education, Part VII, Stanford University, March, 1969, 84.

Spencer, L.W. Eleven Years of Change in the Role of Deans of Women in Colleges, Universities and Teachers Colleges. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, XIV (January 1951), 51-83.

Stafford, R.L. An Analysis of Consciously Recalled Motivating Factors and Subsequent Professional Involvement for American Women in New York State. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1967. (University Microfilms Publication No. 67-11, 147)

Stevenson, F.B. Women Administrators in Big Ten Universities. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1973.

Stogdill, R.M. Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of Literature. Journal of Psychology, XXV (1948), 35-71.

Stogdill, R.M., Wherry, R.J., and Jaynes, W.E. A Factorial Study of Administrative Performance. Patterns of Administrative Performance. Research Monograph 81, Columbus: Ohio State University, Bureau of Business Research, 1956.

Stroud, J.S. To New Deans: Catch a Falling Star. Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, XXX (Winter 1967), 95.

Sturtevant, S.M., and Strang, R. A Personnel Study of Deans of Women in Teachers Colleges and Normal Schools. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1928.

Taylor, H.A. Women in Administration. American School and University, XXXVI, No. 4 (December 1963), 21-23.

_____. Today's Education. The Journal of the National Education Association (September-October 1973), 95-96.

Toman, W. Never Mind Your Horoscope, Birth Order Rules All. Psychology Today, IV, No. 7 (December 1970), 45-49, 68-69.

Trecher, J. L. Woman's Place is in the Curriculum. Saturday Review. (October 16, 1971), 83-86 and 92-94.

Truman, D. B. Address delivered November, 1972, Mount Holyoke College.

Turner, M. B. Women and Work. Edited by Irving Bernstein, Los Angeles, Institute of Industrial Relations, University of California, 1964.

Upcraft, M. L. Role Expectations for Chief Personnel Administrators in Large Universities. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.

U.S. Department of Labor. Trends in Educational Attainment of Women. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, October, 1969.

Van Dalen, D. B. and Meyer, W.J. Understanding Educational Research. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972.

Watley, D.J. Career or Marriage?: A Longitudinal Study of Able Young Women. National Merit Scholarship Corporation, Research Report, 1969, pp. 5, 7.

_____. WEAL, Facts About Women in Education. In Women's Work Has Just Begun. Ann Arbor, Michigan, Institute of Continuing Legal Education, 1972, pp. 275-276.

Weber, C.A. Leadership in Personnel Management in Public Schools. St. Louis: Greene, Inc., 1970.

White, R. K., and Lippitt, R. O. _Autocracy and Democracy, An Experimental Inquiry._ New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.

Whitney, M. E. Women Student Personnel Administrators: The Past and the Future. _Journal of College Student Personnel_, XII, No. 1 (January 1971), 7-10.

APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENTATION

BIOGRAPHICAL QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Name: _____

2. Title: _____

3. Age: 20-30 ( )   31-40 ( )   41-50 ( )   51+ ( )

4. Current marital status: S ( )   M ( )   D ( )   W ( )
   If married, how long? Less than 2 yrs.   ( )
                          For 5 - 10 yrs. . ( )
                          More than 10 yrs. ( )

5. Number of children: none ( ) one ( )   two or more ( )

6. Size of university in which you are employed:
                          under 2,500   ( )
                          2,500-5,999   ( )
                          6,000-10,000   ( )
                          above 10,000   ( )

7. Salary range: to $14,000 ( ) $15,000-19,999 ( )
      $20,000 - 24,999 ( )   Above $25,000 ( )

8. Education: Institution   Dates Attended   Degree Major
                _____   _____ _____ _____
                _____   _____ _____ _____
                _____   _____ _____ _____
                _____   _____ _____ _____

9. Are you working toward an advanced degree? Yes ( ) No ( )
   MA ( )   Doctorate ( )   Other ( ) _____

10. List, in chronological order, the last professional positions you
    have held (no more than five):

         Title   Type of Organization   Mo./Yr.
    _____   _____   _____
    _____   _____   _____
    _____   _____   _____
    _____   _____   _____

11. Have you published in the last five years?   Yes ( )   No ( )
    Books ( )   Articles ( )   Other ( ) _____

12. Have you been affiliated with a feminist group in the past five
    years?   Yes ( )   No ( )

13. List your professional memberships and the positions you have
    held in any of these organizations in the past five years:

    <table>
    <tr><td align="center">Organizations</td><td align="center">Positions</td></tr>
    <tr><td>_____</td><td>_____</td></tr>
    <tr><td>_____</td><td>_____</td></tr>
    <tr><td>_____</td><td>_____</td></tr>
    <tr><td>_____</td><td>_____</td></tr>
    </table>

14. A. Are you responsible for the operations of:
       one departmental or organizational unit? ( )
       more than one departmental or organizational unit? ( )

    B. Are you responsible for the development and/or approval
       of budget(s) of: one unit? ( )   more than one unit? ( )

    C. Do you initiate and/or approve operating policies for:
       one unit? ( )   more than one unit? ( )

15. A. How many brothers and sisters did you have? _____
    B. Were you the oldest child?   Yes ( )   No ( )
    C. Were you the oldest female child? Yes ( )   No ( )
    D. Were you the youngest child?   Yes ( )   No ( )

16. Was your mother employed while you were a child?   Yes ( )
                                                       No ( )

    If yes, at what level? Professional ( )
                            Managerial   ( )
                            Service occupation ( )
                            Other ( )

17. At what level was your father employed?
                            Professional ( )
                            Managerial   ( )
                            Service occupation ( )
                            Other ( )

18. Which parent do you feel had the greater influence on you?
            Mother ( )   Father ( )

19. What would you consider your major problem as a woman administrator?

_____

_____

20. In your judgment, what do you consider to be the most influential factors for being in your current position? (Number in rank order)

    Skill ( )   Communication ability ( )

    Qualifications ( )   Demonstrated leadership

    Sex ( )   ability ( )

    Training or Background ( )   No other candidate available ( )

              Other ( ) _____

    Comment:

_____

_____

21. Do you consider your position as top level management? ( )
Middle management? ( )   Other ( ) _____

22. Would you like a copy of the abstract for this study? Yes ( )
              No ( )

APPENDIX B

COMMUNICATIONS

Pre-letter sent by NAWDAC

Cover letter

Reminder notice sent to administrators

National
Association
for Women Deans,
Administrators,
& Counselors

1028 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. • Suite 922
Washington, D.C. • 202/659-9330, 659-9331

November 20, 1973

Dear Administrator:

In a few days you will be receiving a questionnaire from
Marilyn Schlack of Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo,
Michigan. The questionnaire seeks data about the personal
characteristics and leadership opinions of 150 randomly
selected women administrators in student personnel ser-
vices who are members of the National Association for
Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors.

The Research Committee, and officers of NAWDAC believe
that this study merits your attention and response. There-
fore, I am writing to let you know in advance that NAWDAC
encourages your cooperation with this study.

Laurine E. Fitzgerald
Vice President for Professional Development
National Association for Women Deans,
   Administrators, and Counselors

COLLEGE OF EDUCATION   KALAMAZOO, MICHIGAN
Department of Counseling and Personnel   49001

November 23, 1973

Dear Administrator

A few days ago, you received a letter from Dr. Laurine E. Fitzgerald, Vice-President of NAWDAC, telling you about this research study. As you know, there is a growing interest in professional women. However, there seems to be a lack of in-depth studies of those few who are in administrative positions. To complete the research requirements for a doctorate in Counseling and Personnel, I am attempting to add to the studies on women administrators. I realize you are busy and only hope you can take the time to answer the enclosed questionnaires.

My plan is to gather basic biographical information from a random group of women student personnel administrators at the university level. Also, the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) is included. The LOQ is constructed so that there are no right or wrong answers. In fact, I hope to be able to establish a pattern of responses of successful women administrators.

May I emphasize that it is important that you answer all of the questions on both of the questionnaires so that a continuous pattern in women's careers can be traced. Of course, all of the information will remain confidential and unidentifiable.

Enclosed is a return, stamped, self-addressed envelope for your convenience. If you are interested in the results of this study, please indicate on the Biographical Questionnaire (Question 22).

Since the number of women administrators in the field is limited, I would appreciate your help.

Thank you for your prompt consideration.

Sincerely

Marilyn J. Schlack

December 11, 1973

Dear Administrator

You were recently mailed some material which I hope to include in
my research on women administrators in student personnel services.

To date, this response has not been received. Since there are so
few women who are in responsible positions, I would appreciate
your cooperation.

If you have already sent back the material, please disregard this
reminder.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely
Marilyn Schlack

APPENDIX C

Written Comments on Questions 19 and

20 from The Biographical Questionnaire

Written comments by women student personnel administrators to questions 19 and 20 on the Biographical Questionnaire.

Question: What would you consider your major problem as a woman administrator?

Comments: Upper-management women

"My sex."

"Little private life."

"Having male administrators accept my decisions as coming from a fellow administrator rather than from a woman."

"Because I look young and am a woman, I have trouble being taken seriously by some men. I find the problem increases the higher up the administrative bureaucratic ladder one goes!"

"Being seen as an administrator who should be included in decisions, etc., as much as any other administrator (male)."

"Not having opportunity to move up."

"Limited advancement opportunities."

"Being considered an equal by the male administrators."

"The same as any other administrative male or female - making prudent judgments about people and action."

"Less influence on major policy. Less pay--or not proportionately fair."

"Over involvement."

"Sex discrimination. By-passed for promotion. Receive less salary than men doing less responsible work."

"Male colleagues condescending attitude."

"By virtue of my responsibilities, I am seen as holding a staff appointment rather than having line responsibilities. Consequently, I'm not where the action is."

"Having ideas accepted because they were generated by a woman."

"Commanding the same salary that a male would receive in this job."

"It depends on the strength, personal identity, and ability of your male superiors. Very little problem when superiors are really capable."

"Decision-making without undue use of time or energy."

"Stereotyped attitudes."

"Being a woman!"

"None."

"Aloneness--lack of psychological and emotional support from fellow workers, lack of mutual understanding, no professional peers who are women."

"The tendency of my male colleagues to view my actions as those of a woman rather than those of an individual."

"Combining home responsibilities and job time commitments. No professional problems as a woman."

"Not being able to put new ideas and procedures into practice before they become outdated or are no longer pertinent."

"Being the only woman at my level or higher at my institution."

"Advancement in a Catholic school!"

"Personal adjustment to being the only woman in administrative circles."

"Men who are negative to female authority."

"Pressures on my time beyond my professional role. Family responsibilities that require a great deal of time and energy."

"Programs and procedures established without adequate input or planning."

"Lack of secretarial help due to budget squeeze."

"Access to the informal communication processes through which the stage is often set for later decision making, i.e., the locker room discussions."

"I enjoy counseling very much but do not enjoy disciplining students who persist in breaking rules. It is difficult for me to get after assistant deans when they neglect their jobs when it is very clear to them what is expected of them after having previously decided among us who will do which jobs. It is very painful for me to fine someone who is inefficient."

"None other than any administrator."

"Time!"

"Giving directions to men."

"Walking the tightrope between structured administration and democratic and collective movement."

"I have been unable to 'land' a senior administrative position-- have come exceedingly close to getting the only 2 dean of students positions I've applied for--both went to males."

"Lack of academic credentials effects credibility with academicians who are involved in my programs--they are dean level--I am 2nd class citizen in a 2nd class area (student affairs)."

". . . less formal education and considerably younger."

"Feeling accepted professionally by male co-workers."

"Not being taken seriously by male department heads; i.e., being called 'honey,' 'sweetheart,' etc.; having to be extremely aggressive just to get simple points across to other department heads."

"Evaluated as a woman first, as an administrator second-- men still have problems when they work with and especially for a woman."

"Being a woman."

"Insufficient time to work more directly with student groups."

"Momentarily--a very dictatorial supervisor (male)."

"Budgets and approval."

"In present position, really none; in general salary level."

"Time."

"My problems are not related to my womanhood--I am developing skills that are not usually associated with women--I lacked the fiscal background for the job."

"Woman administrator--helping men accept women as able leaders in higher education--runs the full range from top level management to staff positions."

"Monetary."

"Dealing with men administrators who are less organized and efficient than I."

"Male staff members who resent reporting to a woman administrator."

"Not being taken seriously by male colleagues of equal rank and position."

"Budget."

"Discrimination because of femininity results in lack of confidence."

"My own self-defeatist attitudes."

"Protecting the egos of male colleagues and my own feeling of self-esteem."

"Lack of real opportunity for upward mobility regardless of ability--not only personally but for other females."

"Some senior deans and university officers have difficulty in accepting my expertise in all areas of housing."

"It is difficult to accept or fit into some of the leadership styles which many men have and which seem to be the appropriate leadership mode."

"Pay discrimination."

"Sensitizing a traditional educational institution."

"Fellow administrators tend to treat me _first_ as a woman and _second_ as an administrator."

"Overcoming traditional attitudes toward women generally; stereotyped opinion of professional women as lacking femininity."

"Having the opportunity to be involved in important decision making policies."

"Established credibility as an authority figure capable of making tough decisions."

"Being accepted into the informal 'club' (cocktails, lunches, etc.) where most decisions are made."

"Promotion. Salary equity."

"Being accepted by males, staff and students for competence level possessed."

"Asserting myself."

"Getting into the 'old boy' system of decision-making."

"Not political enough."

"Finding suitable positions at a reasonable salary."

"Not being promoted in lines of skills and abilities due to sex."

"Men administrators."

"A lack of authority and responsibility necessary for the position."

"Prejudice against women. Too much ability with too little responsibility. Low expectations of my own ability."

"It i

sty l

app

"Pay

"Sen

"Fe l

se c

"Ove

ste r

fer

"Hav

mak

"Est

mak

"Be i

etc.

"Pro

"Be i

lev e

"As s

"Get

"Not

"Fin

"Not

"Mem

"A la

pos it

"Pre

res p

"Financial support that I see is needed to develop new programs and improve residence hall programs."

"Being _firm_ regarding my decisions."

"Too mild a manner."

"Being considered for advancement outside the traditional female fields."

Question: In your judgment, what do you consider to be the most influential factors for being in your current position? (Number in rank order)

Skill ( )   Communication ability ( )
Qualifications ( )   Demonstrated leadership
Sex ( )   ability ( )
Training or Background ( )   No other candidate available ( )
         Other ( ) _____

         Comment:

Comments: Upper-management women

"I was here as Associate Dean when the vice-chancellor needed someone to work out some transitions and changes--and he wanted me to do it."

"It was my combination of skills and background, plus knowing the institution and community having my head on relatively straight re being a woman and issues for women."

"Either had to fire or re-shuffle me when gave up organization based on Dean of Men/Women."

"If anything, sex would have been a negative influence; other potential candidates were available."

"When hired I was not competing against men for the position; I am retained because I am competent."

"Position had been held by very young women with no training and no experience."

"Wanted a woman in the position; it was mid-semester (an awkward time to change positions) and I was able to move."

"It is questionable if a man would do this job for more than one year--many hassles and no upward mobility on horizon."

"People who recognized my willingness and recommended me for promotions."

"I think I have an excellent academic and professional record and many skills--I do think my sex was a factor as they wanted a woman Ph. D. "

"Ability to rock with punches and work twice as hard with longer hours than others in university.

"I think I earned my way up."

"Knowledge of the campus and relationships with faculty and administrators."

"The tightrope between apathy and bitterness is a hazardous location for the feminist administrator; during a period of backlash, especially. Wish me luck."

"Good recommendations."

"Tenure."

"I was in the right place at the right time with qualifications."

"I began on clerical level and was fortunate enough in the beginning to work for men who recognized my ability and sought to put me to better use."

"Long service in this community."

"The position I am in started out with the title Dean of Women."

"Sex perhaps should be first since I was hired as Dean of Women but the job was retitled."

"I enjoy my work and feel I am good at it. My current boss-- a man--is, fortunately, a fine person to whom sex makes no difference."

Comments: Middle-management women

"Experience. Involvement outside the university. Willing to be flexible as far as working hours are concerned."

"I was hired as Assistant to the Dean of Women--therefore the significance of the sex factor. However, a shift in structure made the Dean of Women the Assistant Dean of Students and I became Assistant to the Dean (a man of course)."

"I was hired for .25 FTE cn a special appointment. I am currently full time."

". . . good judgment."

"I'm a work horse!"

"I think this is an example of affirmative action combined with the 'old-man' recruitment system; i.e., "Hey, X, got any good women?""

"The combination of being both female and black was also a factor."

"I was hired as a sorority advisor. The next year I took over as fraternity advisor (no extra pay because I am a woman)."

"By training and experience. I was not necessarily qualified for student personnel work. I was sought for the position, however, because of my knowledge of the urban community and public administration background."

APPENDIX D

TITLES RECORDED FOR RESPONDENTS

Title	Upper-management		Middle-management	
	f	%	f	%
Vice-President	1	1.4		
Assistant Vice-President	3	3.8		
Assistant to Vice-President	2	2.6	2	4.9
Dean of				
Continuing Education	1	1.4		
Program Development	1	1.4		
Residential Life	1	1.4	1	2.4
Students	8	10.4	.	.
Women	8	10.4	4	9.8
Associate Dean	18	23.4	4	9.8
Assistant Dean	6	7.8	15	36.6
Assistant to Dean	3	3.8	2	4.9
Director of				
Activities	1	1.4	1	2.4
Admissions	1	1.4		
Development Programs			1	2.4
Counseling Center	1	1.4		
Housing	2	7.6		
New Student Programs	1	1.4		
Residential Life	3	3.8		
Student Affairs			1	2.4
Student Development	2	2.6	1	2.4
University Center	1	1.4		
Women's Center	2	2.6	1	2.4
Associate Director of				
Residential Life	1	1.4	1	2.4
Assistant Director of				
Admissions	1	1.4		
Career Development	1	1.4		
Housing	1	1.4		
Residential Life	1	1.4	2	4.9
Assistant to Director			1	2.4
Coordinator of				
Activities	1	1.4		
Career Development			1	2.4
Extended Learning	1	1.4		
New Students	1	1.4		
Orientation	1	1.4		
Student Personnel	1	1.4		
Women's Center	1	1.4		
Associate Coordinator			1	2.4
Assistant Coordinator			2	4.9
TOTAL	77	100.0	41	100.0
Dual Titles	8	10.4	4	9.8