

INFORMATION TO USERS

This reproduction was made from a copy of a document sent to us for microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this document, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify markings or notations 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 through an image and duplicating adjacent pages to assure complete continuity.
2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a round black mark, it is an indication of either blurred copy because of movement during exposure, duplicate copy, or copyrighted materials that should not have been filmed. For blurred pages, a good image of the page can be found in the adjacent frame. If copyrighted materials were deleted, a target note will appear listing the pages in the adjacent frame.
3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., is part of the material being photographed, a definite method of "sectioning" the material has been followed. It is customary to begin filming at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. If necessary, sectioning is continued again—beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.
4. For illustrations that cannot be satisfactorily reproduced by xerographic means, photographic prints can be purchased at additional cost and inserted into your xerographic copy. These prints are available upon request from the Dissertations Customer Services Department.
5. Some pages in any document may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

**University
Microfilms
International**

300 N. Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

8422549

Green, Peggy Levy

THE ADMINISTRATIVE STATUS OF SELECTED WOMEN PHYSICAL
EDUCATORS IN THIRTEEN SOUTHERN STATES

Middle Tennessee State University

D.A. 1984

University
Microfilms
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Copyright 1985

by

Green, Peggy Levy

All Rights Reserved

THE ADMINISTRATIVE STATUS OF SELECTED WOMEN
PHYSICAL EDUCATORS IN THIRTEEN
SOUTHERN STATES

Peggy Levy Green

A dissertation presented to the
Graduate Faculty of Middle Tennessee State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree Doctor of Arts

August, 1984

THE ADMINISTRATIVE STATUS OF SELECTED WOMEN
PHYSICAL EDUCATORS IN THIRTEEN
SOUTHERN STATES

APPROVED:

Graduate Committee:

John L. MacBeth
Major Professor

W. S. Brown
Committee Member

Malcolm R. Napier
Committee Member

L. D. Perry
Head of the Department of Health, Physical Education,
Recreation, and Safety

Mary Norton
Dean of the Graduate School

© 1985

PEGGY LEVY GREEN

All Rights Reserved

Abstract

THE ADMINISTRATIVE STATUS OF SELECTED WOMEN
PHYSICAL EDUCATORS IN THIRTEEN
SOUTHERN STATES

by Peggy Levy Green

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the administrative status of selected women physical educators in 13 southern states. A population of 141 administrators consisted of 38 physical education chairpersons, 21 athletic directors, 7 associate athletic directors, 11 assistant athletic directors, 34 intramural directors, 7 associate intramural directors, and 23 assistant intramural directors. The survey method was used to collect the data using a two-part questionnaire. The computerized responses were reported in terms of a raw score and as a percentage of the total population surveyed. Based upon the findings the following conclusions were made:

1. Since 94.3% of all administrators were white, it was concluded that white women were more successful in attaining administrative positions than nonwhite women.
2. Since 66.4% of the women held master's degrees and 22.1% held doctoral degrees, it was concluded that a

Peggy Levy Green

master's degree or higher was a prerequisite for administrative positions.

3. It was concluded that tenure is more attainable in top administrative positions than in lower administrative positions.

4. Women's chances of acquiring administrative positions were about the same via application (51.1%) as through promotion (48.9%).

5. Since 70.0% of the women acquired their positions following the issuance of Title IX, it was concluded that Title IX was an influential factor in women being considered for administrative positions in physical education.

6. The salary ranges of administrators were about the same with an average salary of \$22,283.444 in public institutions, \$17,499.465 in private institutions, and \$19,891.454 in both public and private institutions.

7. The administrative status of women physical educators is high because over 50.0% of the administrators indicated having total responsibility and 36.0% were responsible sometimes for planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting their programs.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is my wish to express appreciation to Dr. Jon L. MacBeth for serving as major professor and offering the needed direction, constructive criticisms, suggestions and motivation. Further thanks are given to Dr. A. H. Solomon for being objective and considerate in reviewing the written material, offering constructive criticisms, and suggestions. Appreciation is expressed to Dr. Wallace Maples for timely responses to requests, suggestions, constructive criticisms, and for being objective in reviewing the written material.

Raquel Rodriguez gave invaluable assistance in computerizing the data, thank you. Fellow students are thanked for contributing their support and encouragement throughout my study. Special thanks to Patrick Obinabo for many reminders and reviews.

Sincere gratitude is extended to my family for their encouragement and unselfish support in the preparation of this dissertation and throughout my study. Special thanks to my husband, Jimmy K. Green, Terrell, mother, and brother for supporting me with understanding, love and faith.

There are two other persons that I would like to give special thanks to: Mr. R. Winston Wrenn, for the

needed considerations and assistance in completing this degree, and Mrs. Wilma Grant, a highly competent professional. A very special thank you for your invaluable and needed assistance throughout my study in the D.A. program, and especially the completion of the dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF APPENDIXES	ix
Chapter	
I. Introduction	1
Purpose of the Study	3
Limitations of the Study	4
Definitions of Terms	4
Hypothesis	6
Significance of the Study	7
Basic Assumptions	8
Summary	8
II. Review of Related Literature	9
Administration	16
A Focus on Women	27
Summary	39
III. Methods and Procedures	41
Survey Population	41
Instrument	41
Collecting the Data	43
Analyses of the Data	44
Summary	45

Chapter	Page
IV. Analyses of Data	47
Statistical Procedures	50
Section I: General Information	51
Section II: Administrative Responsibility	77
Summary	88
V. Summary, Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations.	90
Summary	90
Findings	90
Conclusions	93
Recommendations	97
APPENDIXES	98
BIBLIOGRAPHY	131

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Age Range Based on the Administrative Position Held	54
2. Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Race Based on the Administrative Position Held	55
3. Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to the Highest Degree Held Based on the Administrative Position Held	57
4. Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Experience Based on the Administrative Position Held	58
5. Chi Square Summary of Position Held by Administrators Based on the Type of Institution	59
6. Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to the Enrollment Size of the Institution Based on the Position Held	61
7. Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Tenure Status Based on the Administrative Position Held	62
8. Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Teaching Time Based on the Administrative Position Held	64
9. Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Release Time Based on the Administrative Position Held	65
10. Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to How the Position was Acquired Based on the Administrative Position Held	66

Table	Page
11. Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Rank Based on the Administrative Position Held	68
12. Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Staff Size Based on the Administrative Position Held	69
13. Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to the Type of Program Based on the Administrative Position Held	71
14. Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Salary Range Based on the Size of the Institution Enrollment	72
15. Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Salary Range Based on the Administrative Position Held	74
16. Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Administrative Time Based on the Administrative Position Held	76
17. Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Planning Based on the Administrative Position Held	78
18. Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Organizing Based on the Administrative Position Held	80
19. Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Staffing Based on the Administrative Position Held	81
20. Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Directing Based on the Administrative Position Held	82
21. Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Coordinating Based on the Administrative Position Held	84

Table	Page
22. Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Dean Reporting Based on the Administrative Position Held	85
23. Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Chairperson Reporting Based on the Administrative Position Held	86
24. Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Budgeting Based on the Administrative Position Held	87
25. Summary of Administrators' Responses and Percentages of Total Responses to the Eight Areas of Administrative Responsibility	89

LIST OF APPENDIXES

Appendix	Page
A. Cover Letter	99
B. Questionnaire	101
C. Follow-up Letter	107
D. Summary of Administrators' Responses to Questionnaire Items Based on the Type of Institution	109
E. Summary of Administrative Responses to Questionnaire Items Based on the Enrollment Size of the Institution	115
F. Summary of Administrators' Responses to Questionnaire Items Based on the Position Held	123

Chapter I

Introduction

Few studies have addressed themselves to women in administration and specifically to women administrators in physical education in higher education. A status study was needed regarding women physical educators involved in administration, their specific positions, duties, and salaries.

Although "no significant differences exist between men and women that would limit the capacity of women to perform effectively in managerial roles" (Reif, Newstorm, & Monczka, 1975, p. 78), women are noticeably lacking among practitioners. Resick, Seidel, and Mason (1970), in their book, revealed that unequal opportunities for and suppression of women in educational administration yet remain. The-higher-the-fewer rule is true in administration as well as in teaching, due to the decrease in the percentage of women as rank increases (Shaffer, 1970). Kaufman (1961), in her doctoral dissertation, suggested that "all other things being equal, e.g., merit, qualifications, and experience, gender is often a decisive factor in the appointment to an administrative position in higher education" (p. 5).

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 is the result of organized action for equality in society opposing discrimination

against individuals (Stencel, 1971, p. 53). The Equal Employment Act of 1972 was an amendment to the 1964 Civil Rights Act which covered educational institutions stating, "Discrimination against minorities and women in the field of education is as pervasive as discrimination against minorities and women in any other area of employment" (Stencel, 1977, p. 53).

The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare revealed that "In other areas of employment, statistics for educational institutions indicate that minorities and women are precluded from the most prestigious and higher-paying positions, and are relegated to the more menial and lower-paying jobs" (Stencel, 1977, p. 53).

According to Deckard, "to give women and minority members a truly equal chance, affirmative action is needed on every campus in every profession" (Deckard, 1979, p. 148). These legal ramifications, and others, have created vast implications for change in administration.

Economic conditions caused an emergence of women as a strong sector in the labor force which focused attention upon them as a group. In 1976 women made up approximately 45% of all workers in the labor force in the nation with a projected 48% in 1990 (Stencel, 1979, p. 93). Thus it was of value to ascertain how effectively women were being used

in the field of physical education as administrators in higher education to provide a basis for making recommendations relative to women's future development. The limited number of existing studies on women administrators in physical education revealed the need for a status study regarding women physical educators involved in administration in higher education. This study attempted to answer the following questions:

1. Are women physical educators being given administrative titles with little or no administrative responsibility?
2. How much administrative responsibility do women physical education administrators have relative to other women administrators?
3. What were the salaries of women physical educators in administration in higher education?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the role of women administrators in physical education in colleges and universities in 13 southern states. A general comparison was made of:

1. The administrative responsibility of women physical education chairpersons with that of directors (associate and assistant) of intramurals and athletics in colleges and universities within the Southern District American Alliance

for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (SDAAHPERD).

2. The salary range of women physical education department chairpersons with that of directors (associate and assistant) of intramurals and athletics in colleges and universities within SDAAHPERD.

Limitations of the Study

This study, of necessity, was limited:

1. To women physical education (intramurals and athletics) administrators (chairpersons, directors, associate directors, and assistant directors) within SDAAHPERD at the college and university level.

2. To a population of 277 women administrators within 13 southern states of the United States of America. Inquiries were made by the investigator through professional contacts, The 1981-82 National Directory of College Athletics, and The 1981 National Intramural Recreational Sports Directory.

Definitions of Terms

The terms listed below will be used in this study to mean the following:

Administration is

concerned with the functions and responsibilities essential to the achievement of established goals through associated effort. It is also concerned with that group of individuals who are responsible

for directing, guiding, coordinating, and inspiring the associated efforts of individual members, so that the purposes for which an organization has been established may be accomplished in the most effective and efficient manner possible (Bucher, 1979, p. 5).

Affirmative action is action taken by an employer to remedy the effects of job discrimination and to stop such discrimination.

Equal Rights Amendment states that equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any state on account of sex.

Patriarchy describes a household in which the father is the supreme head.

POSDCORB are initials used by Gulick and Urwick (cited in Bucher, 1979, p. 16) to outline the functions of an administrator referring to (a) planning, (b) organizing, (c) staffing, (d) directing, (e) coordinating, (f) reporting, and (g) budgeting.

SDAAHPERD are the initials used to identify the Southern District American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance which is composed of 13 southern states.

Title IX is Public Law 92-318 which prohibits sex discrimination in any activity sponsored by a school receiving federal funds.

Women's liberation is a social movement attempting to move women toward economic, political, psychological, and at times even biological equality with men (Dubrin, 1972, p. 24).

Hypothesis

There will be no specific hypothesis to be tested because this study is of a descriptive nature. The Methods of Educational Research book by Englehart (1972) states that:

In survey or other descriptive studies in education problems may be merely declarative statements of the purpose of research; or they may be general questions followed by subordinate questions. Although the questions may imply hypotheses or tentative solutions, such solutions are seldom stated in connection with the statement of the problem. The answers are in the data later reported and summarized. (p. 17)

Englehart (1972) further states relative to the use of hypotheses that in

many reports of survey-type research, hypotheses are not stated. Where the problem is one of describing practices or conditions without concern for relationships, the problem does not call for the testing of hypotheses. (p. 48)

In order to explore possible differences on key questions, the investigator compared the administrative responsibility and the salary range of women physical education department chairpersons with that of women directors (associate and assistant) of intramurals and athletics in colleges and universities. The comparisons were made on Questionnaire Item 16 and Part II (Items 1-8). The investigator does not expect a big difference in the administrative responsibility among women physical education administrators.

Significance of the Study

This study will be of value to administrators, counselors, teachers, students, and other professionals interested in administration and physical education. The study will be beneficial to these individuals because it will give them insight concerning the administrative status of women and possible career opportunities. These individuals would also be knowledgeable of certain career patterns and be able to give women students sound advice about entry jobs, preparation for those jobs, as well as aid in career goal planning.

It was hoped that the knowledge of the number of women in administration would encourage counselors and academic advisers to urge certain young women to set higher goals for themselves than those which have traditionally existed for women. The advancement of women in

administration is a part of the larger movement of women into higher education, labor, and other professions outside the home. Thus, the results of this study could be of interest to students of the educational and social history of women. This study could prove to be valuable as a reference for individuals conducting similar studies in the future.

Basic Assumptions

The investigator of this study assumed:

1. That the respondents followed instructions and participated totally.
2. That the administrators were honest and sincere in their responses to the questions that made up the instrument.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to give the reader a very informative picture of what the study was concerned with. Chapter I related to the reader the purpose of the study, its problems, the limits of the study, terms that were used, and the significance of the study. The investigator informed the reader of the basic assumptions relative to the study.

Chapter II will review the literature relative to this study. The literature will be relative to administration, and a focus on women.

Chapter II

Review of Related Literature

To an increasing degree we are seeing today what seems to be a new woman with new interests, new responsibilities, and new ways of doing things. What has changed and is still changing, of course, is not woman herself but her status in a rapidly developing social order, and her ways and means of securing satisfactions and making contributions to social life under the changed conditions in which she has to function. Although there has been a change in women's status, women are noticeably lacking among the ranks of practitioners, but also they are grossly underrepresented among those who hire and fire administrators (boards of education).

In spite of what seems to be increased awareness of the need to recruit women into administrative training programs, statistics reveal that the percentage of women occupying line administrative positions is actually decreasing. The fact is that the precedent for overlooking women as educational leaders on the national level extends back at least as far as the constitution of the National Teachers Association in 1857 which limited membership to gentlemen (National Council of Administrative Women in Education, 1973, p. 2).

The Civil War forced the lifting of some barriers against women. Women found themselves being needed as teachers which necessitated their being educated. However, at the same time that women were beginning to emerge as leaders in education, other people began to talk against women in leadership roles. William Chancellor in 1915 wrote that "feminization of the schools had gone altogether too far" (p. 183). He felt that men should be appointed principals because they had a "superior executive gift" and could do administrative work in between teaching. He also stated that teaching and administering would worry women too much and that it was well known that women preferred teaching under a "male principal who was more just, patient, and sympathetic" (p. 183).

The current beliefs in male dominance and superiority can be traced to the beginnings of patriarchal society. It appears to be very difficult to change these beliefs. Andrew J. Dubrin (1972) suggests that "radical feminists push for an overthrow of a patriarchal system in which (according to their perception) men control all of society's levers of power in government, industry, education, science, and the arts" (p. 35).

The prevailing ideas and attitudes held by both men and women in society are largely "the product of the particular

economic and social arrangements that prevailed prior to the industrial revolution, when society, economically and socially, was organized primarily around the home as the producing unit, and before standards of value had become so definitely identified with a money standard as in our present price and profit economy" (Dubrin, 1972, p. 36). Society has made attempts to change these beliefs through legal forces, groups and organizations, and legislation. The legal forces involve affirmative action programs, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and Title IX. The 1971 Supreme Court ruled that unequal treatment based on sex violates the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution (provides all citizens with equal protection under the law). Title VII of the Civil Rights Act for 1964 (as amended by the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972) is principally concerned with employment inclusive of educational institutions and states that "there be no discrimination in hiring, upgrading salaries, fringe benefits, training, and other conditions of employment on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin or sex" (Geadelmann, 1977, p. 37).

The Senate approved the Women's Equal Rights Amendment in 1972 which states that "equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any state on account of sex" World Book Encyclopedia, 1979,

p. 319). (It did not get the number of state ratifications necessary to become a law, therefore it was not passed in 1982). Another area of support comes from organizations such as AAHPERD, which offers support of those pursuing equal opportunity in education. In 1972, President Barbara Forker

established a committee to study discrimination against women and girls, with specific objectives of investigating: (1) discrimination in salary, promotions, and tenure, (2) administrative opportunities for the female, and (3) coaching qualifications and opportunities. (Geadelmann, 1977, p. 144)

Opportunities for women in education other than classroom teaching are often few but, according to Judith Smith (1978), "even women expect that men will occupy administrative and policy making positions" (p. 114). Cynthia Epstein (1973), with similar views, has brought out the fact that women may contribute to women not being able to advance into administrative positions in these statements:

Some women who choose the domestic life may resent women who aspire for the upper-echelons in the professions. At times these women may deride those who choose careers and even accuse them of neglecting the duties of their station in life.
(p. 26)

Smith (1978), in agreement, states that other women who have advanced to elite positions in American society may reject associations with spokespersons for the sex equality cause. Women do not always help other women advance in their career aspirations. This is evident in existing literature supporting the hypothesis that women who have succeeded to the top are Queen Bees. Staines, Tarris, and Jayaratne (1974) describe a Queen Bee as "a woman who has succeeded professionally [as evidenced by a high-status job and a good salary] and socially [as evidenced by popularity with men, attractiveness, and a good marriage]" (p. 56). Benton (1980) suggests that "Queen Bees"

look like a woman yet think like a man and are able to perform a traditional and a non-traditional role simultaneously but effectively. Ironically, the Queen Bees in higher education are in excellent positions to recruit, support, and recommend other women, but are not inclined to do so. Instead the Queen Bee prefers to denigrate the efforts of other women and protect her own image of "superman."

(p. 6)

As one looks for women employed in leadership roles in education today it quickly becomes apparent that women are much underrepresented as educational administrators. Silver (1977) agrees with this statement and asks these questions: "But why should it be the case?" and "Is it possible that

women are less adequately trained than men in their preservice preparation programs" (p. 207). These questions raise a provocative question of: What makes a leader? Little or no research has been found to support the existence of universal leadership traits; thus it is safe to assume that leadership has no gender. Professional preparation requirements should include certain essentials for both men and women. Bucher (1979) believes such essentials should include:

taking foundation work in cognate fields, knowing himself or herself as an individual and as a potential administrator, having technical and conceptual understanding of the community, recognizing the importance of instruction, studying and practicing decision making, and realizing the importance of human relations. Finally, there should be on-the-job learning experience that is closely supervised by an experienced professor. (p. 19)

In order to better prepare the women for administration, training programs should guide women to exhibit tolerance, sensitivity, and respect toward their male co-workers if they expect such treatment in return. A status report by McCarthy and Webb (1977) suggested that:

Women should be prepared to rely on their competencies rather than their grievances.

Appropriate training can help females focus their efforts in productive channels instead of the feminist movement. Women should not, however, operate under the mistaken impression that ability will ensure an easy route to success. (p. 51)

McCarthy and Webb (1977) also suggest that women need special training in techniques for establishing rapport with women staff members capitalizing on the strengths of such relationships instead of the weaknesses. Aspiring women administrators need to be aware of the special problems they may encounter in establishing rapport with secretaries. If not, according to McCarthy and Webb, they may blindly alienate the much-needed affection and loyalty of their office staff.

Women administrators may also be unprepared to handle the subtle discrimination which can accompany their relationships with women subordinates and men. Most of this doubt exists among men who have never been associated with a woman superior. One study revealed that "men who have worked under women administrators rank women as high or higher than their male counterparts" (McCarthy & Webb, 1977, p. 55). In order to combat the stereotype of women as passive, subordinate inferior beings, some women feel that they must claw, scratch, and clobber their way to the top. This is not necessary in assuming positions that have been

traditionally held by men. According to Bloom, Pearlman, and Coburn (1976), women have

few female role models to follow, and consequently many women attempt to pattern their behavior after the prized male traits of achievement, aggression, and dominance. Some women believe that their success in male-dominated organizations demands that they be better than men holding similar positions. The unfortunate consequence of this line of reasoning is that women often magnify these "treasured" male characteristics and thus become super-aggressive and or super-dominant. Feminine qualities are sacrificed in an attempt to become "one of the boys." (pp. 8-9)

According to Deckard (1979), "many young girls never see, much less get to know, even one intelligent, dedicated professional woman who could serve as a role model" (p. 49). The following segments of related literature will cover (a) administration and (b) a focus on women.

Administration

Administration is a part of most organizational structures and physical education is no exception. Administration is also a controversial subject in today's educational system at all levels. A broad range of questions and interest has been expressed by the public as a whole generating greater concern in how programs are managed

and the politics behind them. As for men, tradition has supported their roles as administrators, whereas legal implications have supported women in administrative positions.

The traditional view of administration revolved around the idea that administration existed in order to carry out the policies that had been developed by the duly constituted policy-forming group such as a board of education. Although both men and women experience the same professional preparation, the male dominates in securing the position. Another traditional view of administration, according to Bucher (1979), is that "the best way to prepare to administer was to practice administering; experience was seen to be the best teacher" (p. 14). He stated the modern view of administration as

recognizing the value of experience but at the same time maintains that there exists a body of knowledge or theory that, when mastered, can help the administration play a more effective role in the organization with which it is associated. (p. 14)

Another plus for men interested in administration is the many informal settings for making crucial decisions, such as handball courts, locker rooms, and so forth. According to McCarthy and Webb (1977):

Male administrators have the opportunity to learn professional etiquette and be groomed for

promotions. . . . Women are denied these advantages because they are left out of the arenas. This is not an evil plot against women; it is simply an example of "tradition," resulting in the exclusion of women from the forums where important decisions are made. (p. 55)

Promotion practices are also on a buddy system in school districts and departments. According to one study (McCarthy & Webb, 1977), "men most often enter the profession because they have received encouragement from other administrators" (p. 56). Thus, aspiring male administrators need no formal training program, according to McCarthy and Webb, regarding this buddy system because its trappings come naturally with the job. The aspiring female is thus forced to acquire formal training before she is even considered for the job, and there is no guarantee that she will get the position. Benton (1980) expressed a similar view stating that:

Because higher education institutions have been largely male dominated, so have the informal networks that developed within them. Consequently women have not been able to infiltrate the "old boy" network because women candidates lack visibility and are, therefore, rarely suggested for top-level positions. (p. 6)

Similarly, Daniel Socolow found that the Old Boy network remained the most widely utilized method for selecting a

job candidate. He also suggested that many colleges and institutions "go through the motions of searching widely for qualified candidates, while they in fact rely heavily on familiar recruiting methods" (Socolow, 1978, p. 43). These factors have created a greater interest in administration by society.

The focus of society on administration has generated a more careful look at the qualifications of an administrator and the duties that he or she is to perform. Bucher (1979) states that the trained administrator is responsible for the strong leadership necessary to achieve objectives more effectively. More quality leadership is evident if the administrator is aware of his or her responsibilities. Some responsibilities of an administrator in physical education are the same or similar to other organizational structures. Sisley (1975b) sums this view by stating that many small areas of responsibility encompass the broad field of administration. Thus, the specific areas of responsibility or duties of the administrator must be known by the administrator in each area.

Resick, Seidel, and Mason (1970) list 19 responsibilities of the head of the physical education department as being:

1. To maintain an open, two-way line of communication between the department and the administration.

2. To keep the administration abreast of new developments and theories in physical education.
3. To interpret the field to the administration, the school board, the students, and the public.
4. To fit the department's objectives into the overall educational philosophy of the school--to be responsible for the development of objectives, syllabi, and courses of study.
5. To continuously evaluate and periodically revise the curriculum.
6. To budget for equipment and supplies.
7. To make plans for the purchase and care of equipment.
8. To formulate various necessary policies for the use of equipment and facilities. This is a great problem in physical education because of the attractiveness of the facilities.
9. To formulate the policies necessary for the conduct of the instructional program, including such things as the evaluation of students, the sharing of facilities, and the coeducational program.
10. To orient new teachers in the department.
11. To provide for in-service training such as visitations, demonstration lessons, and attendance at professional meetings.

12. To conduct research relative to the program.

13. To teach. It is the belief of the authors that everyone, including the administrator, should teach at least one class per semester. This will keep him or her aware of practical situations.

14. To make written evaluations of the teachers in the department. He or she must recommend merit increases, continued employment, and dismissals.

15. To schedule regular staff meetings and coordinate staff projects.

16. To plan for new facilities as needed.

17. To carry out the various duties connected only with interscholastic contests such as scheduling, writing of contracts, hiring of officials, and supervision of home contests.

18. To establish a professional library, for both students and staff.

19. To make annual written reports. (p. 35)

Bucher (1979) lists similar responsibilities of the physical education department chairperson but only the responsibilities of the intramural and athletic director will be cited in this research. The more specific duties of the intramural director included:

1. Providing an organizational structure that will best serve the program.

2. Planning programs.
3. Organizing tournaments and other forms of competition.
4. Supervising the maintenance of facilities, equipment, and supplies.
5. Supervising personnel.
6. Attending and planning intramural council meetings.
7. Interpreting the program to the membership, administration, and public in general.
8. Coordinating the program with allied areas such as the physical education instructional program, program for the handicapped, and varsity athletics.
9. Attending professional meetings.
10. Surveying student or member opinion as to program needs.
11. Supervising the program in action.
12. Preparing budgets.
13. Evaluating the worth of the program. (p. 143)

Bucher's (1979) listings of the responsibilities of the athletic director are as follow:

1. Preparing the budget for the sports program,
2. Purchasing equipment and supplies,
3. Scheduling athletic contests,
4. Arranging for officials,

5. Supervising eligibility requirements,
6. Making arrangements for transportation,
7. Seeing that medical examinations of athletes and proper insurance coverage are adequate, and
8. Supervising the program in general. (p. 170)

Sisley (1975a) lists 10 duties but only 5 will be listed due to repetitions of Bucher's listings. She feels that authority should be centered in the athletic director and lists the following major duties:

1. To conduct the program according to policies, rules, and regulations established within the institution and by state, regional and national organization.

2. To organize the athletic personnel for the most effective results. This included making staff assignments, carrying out evaluations and making recommendations for change.

3. To maintain channels of communication among the university administration, coaches and student athletes.

4. To develop an effective public relations program.

5. To act as the official representative from the institution to various athletic organizations.

(p. 122)

Bucher and Dupee (1965) stated other important duties of an athletic administrator as:

1. Administering the objectives for which the program is established.
2. Providing a safe, healthful, and desirable physical environment for conducting sports.
3. Seeing that publicity is in accord with the purposes of the program. (p. 77)

Leadership ability is as important to the administrator as the administrator is to the program relative to quality in both leadership and administration. Administrators must be cognizant of the important roles they play in providing leadership. Success or failure of the program rests on the quality of the leadership. Leadership in regard to women's athletic programs was summarized best by Bowen (1975), stating that:

With the expanding competitive sports program for girls and women, it is imperative that the proper leadership comes forward. The program will grow whether the best women's leadership assumes responsibility for it or not. Some of the "evils" for the program for boys and men have developed because of a failure on the part of men of wisdom and leadership ability to accept their obligation in the early development of these programs.

Likewise, the reluctance to accept the leadership role and the grave problems for women. (p. 47)

Sisley (1975b) has similar views concerning the value of good leadership as being:

The ultimate worth of intercollegiate athletic programs depends on the leadership qualities of the administrators as well as the knowledge skills possessed by the coaches. It is the administrators who have the most critical influence on the conduct of the program. (p. 47)

A limited amount of research has been conducted on women in administration in physical education. More research has been done relative to athletics or sports programs because of the compliance to Title IX. Thus, greater emphasis will be on athletics or sports.

Programs are rapidly growing as a result of Title IX, and Sisley (1975a) states that "overnight women's athletic programs have been approved when none existed" (p. 122). Along with new programs came money and new administrative leadership heads. Again, Sisley (1975a) states that:

The ultimate worth of intercollegiate athletic programs is dependent on the leadership qualities of the administrators as well as on the knowledges and skills which the coaches possess. Administrators, indeed, have the most critical influence on the conduct of the program. (p. 122)

Oglesby, concerned about the administration of intercollegiate athletic programs for women made two future projections, as quoted by Hunt (1976) in her doctoral dissertation:

1. Administrative leadership within athletic departments will become increasingly important. Women must be educated in the administration of athletic affairs.

2. Superintendents, deans, and athletic directors must be kept aware of the development and direction that competition for women is taking. These programs must be educationally sound and must progress through the proper organizational channels. (p. 14)

Bucher (1979, p. 16) quotes Gulick and Urwick in outlining the functions of an administrator in the term POSDCORD. These letters represent the alphabets of each duty of an administrator including (a) planning, (b) organizing, (c) staffing, (d) directing, (e) coordinating, (f) reporting, and (g) budgeting. Relative to administrative functions, Haplin (1957) states that administration refers to human activity involving four components:

1. The functions or tasks to be performed,
2. The formal organization within which administration must operate,

3. The work group or groups with which administration must be concerned, and

4. The leader or leaders within the organization. (p. 161)

Halpin's reference to administration is only one attempt, among many, to define administration. Most definitions of administration are reflective of leadership and the human factor and not gender. Bucher's (1979) definition of administration states that:

Administration is concerned with the functions and responsibilities essential to the achievement of established goals through associated effort. It is also concerned with that group of individuals who are responsible for directing, guiding, coordinating, and inspiring the associated efforts of individual members, so that the purpose for which an organization has been established may be accomplished in the most effective and efficient manner possible. (p. 5)

A Focus on Women

We can no longer ignore that voice within many women that says, "I want something more than my husband and my children and my home" (Friedan, 1963, p. 16). A transition has been occurring for women at a rapid pace. The best publicized and most revolutionary approach to transition is The Women's Liberation Movement. Dubrin (1972) stated

that "women's liberation is a social movement attempting to move women toward economic, political, psychological and at times even biological equality with men" (p. 24). This transition is evident in the rise in managerial positions for women. Deckard (1979) suggested that "the young woman who goes to college has another chance to break out of the stereotyped role society has decreed for her" (p. 52).

Reif, Newstorm, and Monczka (1975) feel that:

Women physical educators may have a unique opportunity to fill leadership roles, since they have had a greater chance to serve as department heads because of their traditional one-sex departments. There is evidence that some colleges, in an attempt to comply with Affirmative Action standards, invaded departments of physical education for women in order to staff administrative positions at the upper-echelon level with females. (p. 15)

Administration offers many career opportunities for both men and women. Women who take advantage of a career in administration are graduates of professional schools.

According to Silver (1977):

The "typical" female job candidate is about 35 years old and is enrolled in an educational administration doctoral program that she expects to complete when she is between 36 and 37 years

of age. There is a 50% probability that she is married and has one child. She is Caucasian and was raised in the Northeast or Midwest, probably in a city. (p. 207)

Women make up about 45% of the labor force in the United States and about 45% of the college graduates are women or more and few hold managerial positions. The status of American women as reported by Stencel (1977) revealed the following:

<u>Education</u>		<u>Employment</u>
Degree holders who are female		Four out of 10 workers
High school diplomas	51%	are women. Women earn \$3 for every \$5 earned by men with similar jobs.
Bachelor's degrees	40	Only 14 per cent of women workers are in professional or technical fields.
Master' degrees	34	Male high school
Doctoral degrees	12	graduates earn as much as women with five years or more of college. (p. 137)

Deckard (1979) suggests that, "the more education a woman has, the more likely she is to hold a job, and over 90 per-cent of women with Ph.D.s work outside the home" (p. 86). One study (Almquist and Angrist, 1971) revealed that 66% of career-oriented college women were daughters of working women. In contrast, only 22% of women not oriented toward a career had working mothers.

Women faculty at all colleges and universities in 1974 showed that, in the academic world, there is a very definite prestige and pay pyramid from the many lowly instructors to the few full professors; "few women hold positions on the higher rungs of the ladder" (Deckard, 1979, p. 138). The woman physical educator is thus concerned about her administrative status and the future projections relative to the availability of employment. Affirmative action is needed to insure upward mobility, but, according to Deckard (1979):

As soon as anything is done, cries of "reverse discrimination" favoring minorities and women become deafening. Most HEW representatives speak to the white male administrators and senior white male professors, who do indeed relate many horror stories about reverse discrimination. (p. 138)

A recent apparent trend regarding the athletic director's position by Geadelmann (1977) revealed that "women, who for some time, have voluntarily administered the embryonic intercollegiate athletic program for women have suddenly found themselves as 'assistant' athletic directors in combined departments and hence have been subtly removed from decision-making positions" (p. 18). This system of trends creates a more unjust situation for women in general but also very effectively denies those in women's athletics the opportunity to create a viable alternative model for athletics.

The concern about upward mobility is commonly found in existing literature. The development of a positive self-concept and confidence in one's administrative ability is the first step toward achieving advancement. Minorities and women, according to Scott (1979),

who enter the decision-making arenas of institutional hierarchies are treading on alien turf, as the executive level of most institutions has traditionally been a world populated by non-minority males. Unfortunately, many minorities and women entering this world for the first time do not realize that professional advancement is something that must be sought, seized, and retained; they naively assume that performance and merit are the only factors used in promotion considerations.

(p. 34)

Scott (1979) also recommended pitfalls to avoid in moving up the hierarchy such as:

1. Minority and women professionals must guard against being "locked into" positions which are outside of the usual professional mobility path.
2. Minority and women professionals should cautiously accept positions as "assistants to" anyone.

3. One must also discern whether or not the job description calls for a supervisory assistant or a highly, skilled secretary.

4. Remember that as a rule of thumb, managerial or supervisory positions have broad functions, and persons holding these positions are not specialists. In other words, a manager does not do the work of his/her subordinates; he/she is in the business of planning and coordinating people and resources. (p. 36)

There were only a few studies relating to the overall view of women in administration (at all levels) and none specifically concerned with women physical educators. Only five of these sources will be included in this study.

The National Council of Administrative Women in Education of the National Education Association published a study in 1952 concerning women administrators in American colleges and universities. The Council's research study attempted to determine the degree of responsibility of the positions occupied by women by asking for the rank of the person or agency to whom the women administrators reported. Data were presented on 971 institutions of higher education with a total of 25,548 administrative positions and full-time faculty of 89,072. Women held 27.6% of the administrative positions.

This study also revealed that in men's colleges only 8.1% of the administrative positions were held by women, whereas in women's colleges women held 74% of the administrative positions. According to the study, 99.1% of the deans of women were women; two men were found to hold such a position (National Council of Administrative Women in Education, 1952, p. 12).

In summary, the Council's study revealed that in areas of general administration women did not exist in substantial numbers. Less than 1% of the presidents in public coeducational colleges were women, with only 2% holding such an office in private coeducational colleges (National Council of Administrative Women in Education, 1952, p. 16).

A second study by Kaufman (1961), a doctoral dissertation, attempted to identify and analyze appointment policies relating to women in selected administrative positions in higher education. The study was based on the hypothesis that gender is often a decisive factor in making administrative appointments. The data were obtained from questionnaires sent to the presidents of 355 colleges and universities for teacher education and 156 women graduates in administration and supervision from the New York University School of Education over a 20-year period. Kaufman determined the qualifications for appointment to specific administrative positions in colleges and universities, the number of women in administrative

positions in institutions of higher learning, and the reasons for appointing women to administrative duties.

The six specific findings of Kaufman's (1961) investigation were:

1. There were discrepancies between theory and practice regarding the sex of the prospective administrator; in theory all respondents agreed that sex should not be a determining factor, yet 43.5 percent of the same respondents felt male administrators were preferable to female administrators.

2. Only 4.4 percent of the selected administrative positions in this study were held by women.

3. The administrative jobs held by women tended to be in traditional "women's areas," e.g. home economics, nursing, and women's physical education.

4. Experience and education were given top priority in preparation for administrative positions.

5. There were not enough qualified women for administrative positions.

6. Education and experience being equal, men fared better professionally than women. (pp. 156-159)

In terms of the hypothesis of this investigation, the data revealed that, while a sex bias did exist, the basis for women not being appointed to administrative positions was a complex one.

A third study (Gardner, 1966) dealt with quantitative information on career patterns of women administrators in institutions of higher education in Illinois. Data were collected on biographical, educational, and professional backgrounds, which were considered to be of importance in influencing career patterns.

Ten findings were listed which justified the accompanying conclusions of Gardner (1966):

1. Two-thirds of the subjects were born in Illinois or bordering states. Therefore, it was concluded that women administrators tended to migrate minimal distances.

2. A majority of the respondents were from families having one or two children, three-fourths of the respondents were from families having three children or less. Therefore women administrators tended to come from small families. In addition, their order of birth within the family did not seem pertinent to their becoming an administrator.

3. Two-thirds of the subjects were not married; therefore single women more successfully

attained administrative positions than did married women.

4. Since 78.4 percent of the women had a master's degree and 17.6 percent held a doctorate, it was indicated that a master's degree was a requisite to an administrative position, and a doctor's degree was helpful.

5. A wide variety of major fields were pursued by the subjects; therefore no specific field of study was more valuable than others in contributing to the successful attainment of administrative status.

6. Women who became administrators followed a career path which usually began with office work or teaching. They then served as an assistant to a person holding a similar position to the one they held as administrators.

7. Women administrators gained their positions for reasons other than specific course work taken at college. However, courses dealing with communications and understanding people had proved valuable to women administrators.

8. Women tended to become administrators between the ages of 25 to 35. However, women did become administrators in an age span of from age 20 until they were past 50.

9. Personal characteristics necessary for a successful administrative career were the ability to understand people, the ability to organize, and the willingness to accept responsibility.

10. Most women administrators reached their status on their own initiative. Those who were aided to achieve their positions found the help through a former employer or supervisor, or in another administrator. (pp. 104-107)

A fourth study by Arter (1972) in 1971 was concerned with the role of women in the administration of state universities and land-grant colleges. The findings and conclusions were based on data collected for 146 responses from women in such top-level administrative positions as president, provost, chancellor, vice-president, dean (other than nursing or home economics), business officer, and director of an academic program or institute on such campuses. Arter made the following conclusions based on the findings:

1. There are very few women in top-level administrative posts in state universities and land-grant colleges.

2. A few women have applied for and been considered for administrative posts but very few of these have been appointed in such institutions in the last five years.

3. The trend is toward more women being appointed to administrative positions in state universities and land-grant colleges, particularly since the issuance of the Executive Order 11246 of the President of the United States and its amendments.

4. Officers of state universities and land-grant colleges are in favor of considering women for top-level administration.

5. Sex is, but need not be, a factor in the selection of top-level administrators in state universities and land-grant colleges.

6. There are relationships between the position, academic rank, and salary of women in top-level administration and the following; (a) personal background, (b) educational background, (c) professional experience, (d) duties of position, and (e) attitudes. (pp. 126-129)

Simpson (1968) conducted the fifth study used in this chapter in 1968 at six colleges in Pennsylvania to determine if employing agents in higher education (deans, department chairmen, faculty) would express discriminating employment attitudes toward academic women presented as being equally qualified with male competitors. He also wanted to know if employing agents in higher education placed women in general in a subordinate position.

Simpson's (1968) study demonstrated that discriminating attitudes toward academic women were exhibited by the sampled employing agents when considering equally qualified male and female candidates. The male candidate was typically chosen when all the variables were equal except sex. Berwald's (1963) findings were consistent with Simpson's study, which indicated that deans, department chairmen, and faculty did not feel that employment opportunities were equal for men and women, and that attitudes and practices strongly favor male selection to the faculty. Although Simpson's study was concerned with hiring practices with faculty of both sexes, there were implications for all academic women.

Summary

This chapter, through related literature, gave the reader a brief historical and informative view of administration and women. The legal effects on the upward mobility of women administrators were discussed both positively and negatively relative to success and failures. Many underlying effects of managerial status were discussed to give the reader insight on the problems encountered by women who choose administration as a career. This chapter also revealed the limited amount of research that has been conducted in physical education and the vast amount that has been conducted in athletics and sports programs.

Chapter III will describe for the reader the method and design used in conducting this study. Included will be the population utilized, the survey instrument, and the means of analyzing the data.

Chapter III

Methods and Procedures

A questionnaire was used to survey and ascertain the status of women administrators in physical education at colleges and universities in 13 southern states. The questionnaire was developed by the investigator from the study of relevant literature and recommendations of the dissertation committee.

Survey Population

The survey population included heads or chairpersons, directors, associate and assistant directors of physical education, intramurals, and athletics. An inquiry was made in order to identify and locate the prospective respondents to the questionnaire. The inquiries were made through professional contacts, The 1981-82 National Directory of College Athletics, and The 1981 National Intramural Recreational Sports Directory. (Thirteen southern states were utilized.) The survey was conducted during the fall of 1981. The initial questionnaires were mailed on October 25, 1981, and the cut-off date was February 24, 1982.

Instrument

The instrument used in this study was a two-part questionnaire developed by the investigator based on the

study of relevant literature and recommendations by the dissertation committee. A pilot study was conducted to assure a reliable method of collecting information needed and for revisions of the instrument. Twelve women administrators in physical education were used in the pilot study. These administrators were selected through the use of a table of random number. For convenience, each administrator was mailed a questionnaire, along with a cover letter and a self-addressed, stamped envelope (see Appendixes A and B). The cover letter clarified the purpose and importance of the research in order to enhance the returns. The data obtained were used in finalizing the development of the survey instrument.

The instrument consisted of two sections: (I) General Information and (II) Administrative Responsibilities. A total of 29 items were included in the questionnaire. The respondents were given a choice of possible responses to each item and instructed to place a check by their choice to the left of the appropriate response. The respondents were instructed to write in responses to certain items on the questionnaire. Spaces were provided for comments by the respondents in Section II of the questionnaire. A copy of the cover letter and questionnaire is included in Appendixes A and B of this study.

Collecting the Data

The questionnaire was mailed to a population of 277 administrators in selected colleges and universities within SDAAPERD with a minimum enrollment of 100 students. The steps taken to collect the data from the SDAAPERD women and administrators were:

1. To construct the questionnaire, cover letter, and follow-up letter.
2. To determine the frame of the questionnaire:
Administrative duties
The position held
The salary range.
3. To conduct the pilot study and make an analysis of the data.
4. To make revisions of the survey instrument.
5. To determine the list of colleges and universities within the SDAAPERD that met the minimum requirement (minimum enrollment of 100 students).
6. To select the list of administrators to receive questionnaires.
7. To mail out the questionnaire along with the cover letter and self-addressed, stamped envelope; mail a follow-up letter to nonresponding administrators after a two-week period of initial contacts; and mail a follow-up letter and questionnaire to the remaining nonresponding administrators after another two-week period.

8. To obtain a proper sampling it was decided that the entire population of 277 administrators from colleges and universities, taken from the inquiry, be used.

9. To record the responses according to school enrollment, the administrative position held, and the type of institution.

10. To analyze data and treat statistically. A copy of the follow-up letter is found in Appendix C of this study.

Analyses of Data

The data were analyzed, in terms of total population responses, to assess the administrative status of women in the 13 southern states. The responses of the total population were categorized according to (a) the size of the student population of the institution, (b) the area of administrative responsibility (physical education, intramurals, or athletics), and (c) the type of institution. A tally sheet was made of all responses to each question by each respondent. These responses revealed the findings and conclusions of this study. The focus was on the position held, the administrative duties, and the salary range.

The data were typed into the Honeywell Computer, verified, and processed in the Computer Center at Middle Tennessee State University. The programs selected to compute the statistics were the Cross Tabs, Chi Square, and

Frequency from the library of available programs in the computer center.

The Frequency program is used to summarize the number of responses to each item on the questionnaire based on three categories. The Cross Tab and Chi Square programs are used to compare two variables simultaneously in order to show the relationship between them. An example would be the incidence of several different age ranges of respondents compared by degrees held by a cross-classification using the Cross Tabs program.

Chi square statistics were tested for significance at the .05 level. To the extent that it is feasible, findings were discussed in the same order as they appeared on the questionnaire.

The responses, based on the category, were reported in terms of a raw score and as a percentage of the total responses. Tables were made for the purpose of understanding the analyses of the data. In addition, a general comparison of the responses, according to the categories of the size of the student population of the institution, the areas of administrative responsibility, and type of institution included. The tables are included in Chapter IV of this study, entitled Analyses of Data.

Summary

The procedures to be used in this study and the statistical treatment were discussed in this chapter. In

addition, the investigator dealt with the respondents who made up the population as well as the collecting and analyzing of data.

Chapter IV is concerned with the results and discussion of these results. Tables are included to clarify the results of the data collected.

Chapter IV

Analyses of Data

This study was designed to evaluate the administrative role of selected women physical educators in colleges and universities in 13 southern states. The survey method was used to collect the data. The survey instrument was a questionnaire developed by the investigator from the study of relevant literature and recommendations of the dissertation committee.

The instrument was a two-part questionnaire which included: (I) General Information and (II) Administrative Responsibilities. Section I of the questionnaire included 17 questions, the screening criteria. The criteria included:

1. Selected Administrators (women physical education administrators--Chairpersons, Athletic Directors, Associate Athletic Directors, Assistant Athletic Directors, Intramural Directors, Associate Intramural Directors, and Assistant Intramural Directors).

2. Selected States (SDAAHPERD--Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia).

3. Selected Institutions (colleges and universities with a minimum enrollment of 100 within 13 southern states--SDAAHPERD).

These criteria eliminated all male respondents, students, coaches, persons in other areas of administration, and persons no longer in administrative positions. Section II of the questionnaire was used to establish the amount of administrative responsibility of the respondents. Twelve items were included in this section along with spaces for comments and other administrative duties not listed in the questionnaire.

Once the survey instrument was developed, a pilot study was conducted. The pilot study was used to assure that the survey method was a reliable means of collecting the data, to make revisions of the instrument, and as a possible predictor of the number of returns in the initial study. There were several similarities in both the pilot study and the initial study that will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

Twelve administrators were randomly selected for the pilot study. These 12 administrators were mailed questionnaires along with a cover letter and a stamped, self-addressed envelope. The same procedure was used in the initial study.

The pilot study results proved to be an accurate predictor of possible returns in the initial study. A total

of 8 (67.0%) women administrators responded to the pilot study by completing or returning the questionnaire. A total of 277 (68.0%) administrators responded in the initial study. The number of returns that were completed and deemed usable in the pilot study was 6 (50.0%) and 141 (51.0%) in the initial study. There was a 1% difference in the total number of responses in the initial study (68.0%) and the pilot study (67.0%). There was also a 1% difference in the total number of returns that were deemed usable in the initial study (51.0%) and the pilot study (50.0%).

Some of the trends established in both the pilot and initial studies decreased the number of respondents used in this study. The directories (The 1981-82 National Directory of College Athletics and The 1981 National Intramural Recreational Sports Directory) listed these persons as administrators, yet 114 returns did not meet the established criteria in the initial study. These eliminations included 6 students, 3 coaches of various sports, 9 persons in other areas of administration, and 96 respondents who indicated that this study did not apply to them. There were 22 responses that caused a further decrease in the total number of participants used in this study. These eliminations included 12 men and 10 incomplete questionnaires. Thus, the total number of administrators was reduced from 410 to 141 to be used in this study.

Statistical Procedures

No specific hypothesis was tested because this study was of a descriptive nature. In view of the purpose of this study, the term descriptive statistics needs to be interpreted. "The term descriptive statistics is often applied to characterize the methods employed in summarizing the obtained data, and the term inferential statistics for sampling statistics to characterize the methods utilized in making and evaluating generalizations from the data" (Englehart, 1982, pp. 194-195). Englehart (1982) states that, relative to the use of hypotheses, the testing of hypotheses is not necessary when the problem describes practices or conditions without concern for relationships.

The main purpose of the collected data was to assess the administrative status of women physical educators in 13 southern states. A tally sheet was made of all responses by each respondent. The data were typed into a Honeywell Computer, verified, and processed in the Computer Center at Middle Tennessee State University. The Cross Tabs program was selected to compute the statistics from the library of available programs in the computer center. The Frequency and Chi Square are results of the Cross Tabs program.

The Cross Tabs-Frequency program summarizes the number of responses to each item on the questionnaire and gives the percentages. The Cross Tabs-Chi Square program was not used but included in the tables.

The responses, based on the category, were reported in terms of a raw score and as a percentage of the total responses (see Tables 1-25). The responses were categorized according to: (a) the type of institution, (b) the enrollment size of the institution, and (c) the position held by the administrator. Focus was on the position held, the administrative duties, and the salary range.

The data were not designed to show any specific relationships among the population. The statistical procedures used in this study were to put the collected data into frequencies and derive a percentage. A total of 141 (51.0%) questionnaires were completed and deemed usable in this study. Nonresponding administrators totaled 133 (49.0%). A description of the responses of the administrators to the items on the questionnaire is provided in the remainder of this chapter. Raw scores and percentages of responses based on the total population have been arranged relative to the category. The results of these responses have been reported in order according to the area in which they appeared on the questionnaire. Tables 1 through 25 have been included to clarify responses to questionnaire items.

Section I: General Information

The first section of the questionnaire was designed to elicit information concerning general characteristics of

administrators participating in this study. Seventeen items made up the general information section.

Sex. Item one, the sex of the respondents, was included as a screening device for this study. Due to the similarity of names found during the inquiry, this item was included. Of the 141 respondents, 83 (58.9%) were in public institutions and 58 (41.1%) were in private institutions. General observations, including both public and private institutions, revealed that 59 (41.8%) administrators were in schools with enrollments of 4,999 and below.

Age range. This section of the questionnaire revealed that 27 (19.1%) administrators ranged from 21 to 30 years of age and 23 (16.3%) administrators ranged from 31 to 40 years of age in public institutions. In private institutions 16 (11.3%) administrators were in the 21- to 30-year-age range and 22 (15.6%) administrators were in the 41- to 50-year-age range. In private institutions 16 (11.3%) administrators were in the 21- to 30-year-age range and 22 (15.6%) administrators were in the 41- to 51-year-age range. This is very similar to Gardner's (1966) findings in her doctoral dissertation on "Women Administrators in Higher Education in Illinois in 1966." Her findings were that "women tended to become administrators in an age span of from 20 until they were past 30" (p. 106). Silver (1977) reported a similar finding, stating that "the 'typical' female job candidate is about 35 years old and enrolled in an educational

administration doctoral program that she expects to complete when she is between 36 and 37 years of age" (p. 207).

Table 1 shows the age ranges of administrators based on the position held.

Race. Based on the type of institution, 77 (54.6%) white Americans were in public institutions. Fifty-six (39.7%) white Americans were representative of the private institutions. The greatest number of administrators was found in institutions with enrollments of 4,999 and below which included 55 (39.0%) white Americans.

Black Americans, Oriental Americans, and Spanish Americans were small in number and reflect the findings in Silver's (1977) study. Silver revealed that the woman administrator ". . . is Caucasian and was raised in the northeast or Midwest, probably in a city" (p. 207). Table 2 shows the administrator's race based on the position held.

Highest degree. In public institutions 53 (37.9%) administrators held master's degrees and 24 (17.1%) administrators held doctoral degrees. At private institutions 40 (28.6%) administrators held master's degrees and only 7 (5.0%) administrators held doctoral degrees. These findings are reflective of Gardner's (1966) study, concluding that "since 78.4 percent of the women had a master's degree and 17.6 percent held a doctorate, it was

Table 1
Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Age Range
Based on the Administrative Position Held

Administrative Position	Age Range										Total	
	21 to 30		31 to 40		41 to 50		51 to 60		61 and Above		N	%
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
1. P.E. Chairperson	3	2.1	4	2.8	14	9.9	14	9.9	3	2.1	38	27.0
2. Athletic Director	7	5.0	5	3.5	6	4.3	3	2.1	0	0.0	21	14.9
3. Assoc. A.D.	0	0.0	3	2.1	3	2.1	1	0.7	0	0.0	7	5.0
4. Asst. A.D.	2	1.4	5	3.5	2	1.4	1	0.7	1	0.7	11	7.8
5. Intramural Director	11	7.8	9	6.4	10	7.1	4	2.8	0	0.0	34	24.1
6. Assoc. Im. D.	3	2.1	2	1.4	1	0.7	1	0.7	0	0.0	7	5.0
7. Asst. Im. D.	17	12.1	5	3.5	0	0.0	1	0.7	0	0.0	23	16.3
TOTAL	43	30.5	33	23.4	36	25.5	25	17.7	4	2.8	41	100.0

χ^2 58.60234

χ^2 .95, 24=36.415

χ^2 .99, 24=42.980

Table 2

Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Race
Based on the Administrative Position Held

Administrative Position	Race											
	American Indian		Black American		Oriental American		Spanish American		White American		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. P.E. Chairperson	0	0.0	3	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	35	24.8	38	27.0
2. Athletic Director	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	20	14.2	21	14.9
3. Assoc. A.D.	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7	6	4.3	7	5.0
4. Asst. A.D.	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	7.8	11	7.8
5. Intramural Director	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	34	24.1	34	24.1
6. Assoc. Im. D.	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	5.0	7	5.0
7. Asst. Im. D.	0	0.0	2	1.4	1	0.7	0	0.0	20	14.2	3	16.3
TOTAL	1	0.7	5	3.5	1	0.7	1	0.7	133	94.3	141	100.0

χ^2 36.95753

χ^2 .95,24=36.415

χ^2 .99,24=42.980

indicated that a master's degree was a requisite to an administrative position, and a doctor's degree was helpful" (p. 104).. Table 3 shows the administrators' responses to the highest degree held based on the position held.

Experience. Administrators in public institutions had a range of 0 to 41 years of experience. The greatest number of administrators, 27 (19.1%), had 0 to 5 years of experience in public institutions. Twenty-five (17.7%) administrators were in the 21 to 41 year experience range with only 15 (10.6%) in the 16 to 20 year range of experience. In private institutions there were 29 (20.6%) administrators with 21 to 41 years of experience and only 13 (9.2%) with 0 to 5 years of experience. Table 4 shows the responses of administrators to the years of experience based on the position held.

Title of position. This was one of the questions used to categorize the data. Table 5 shows the position held by administrators based on the type of institution.

At public institutions there were 17 (12.1%) physical education chairpersons. In private institutions there were 21 (14.9%) physical education chairpersons and only a small number of athletic directors.

Research shows that physical education is one of the traditional areas of administration for women. Kaufman (1961) concluded in her status study that "the administrative jobs held by women tended to be in traditional 'women's

Table 3

Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to the Highest Degree Held Based on the Administrative Position Held

Administrative Position	Degree Held									
	Bachelor		Master		Specialist		Doctoral		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. P.E. Chairperson	0	0.0	18	12.9	1	0.7	19	13.6	38	27.1
2. Athletic Director	3	2.1	12	8.6	3	2.1	3	2.1	21	15.0
3. Assoc. A.D.	0	0.0	5	3.6	1	0.7	1	0.7	7	5.0
4. Asst. A.D.	0	0.0	10	7.1	0	0.0	1	0.7	11	7.9
5. Intramural Director	5	3.6	23	16.4	0	0.0	6	4.3	34	24.3
6. Assoc. Im. D.	1	0.7	5	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	6*	4.3
7. Asst. Im. D.	2	1.4	20	14.3	0	0.0	1	0.7	23	16.4
TOTAL	11	7.9	93	66.4	5	3.6	31	22.1	140	100.00

χ^2 44.85112

*1 missing

χ^2 .95,18=28.869

χ^2 .99,18=34.805

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 4

Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Experience
Based on the Administrative Position Held

Administrative Position	Years of Experience											
	0 to 5		6 to 10		11 to 15		16 to 20		21 to 41		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. P.E. Chairperson	3	2.1	3	2.1	0	0.0	4	2.8	28	19.9	38	27.0
2. Athletic Director	5	3.5	2	1.4	2	1.4	4	2.8	8	5.7	21	14.9
3. Assoc. A.D.	1	0.7	0	0.0	3	2.1	1	0.7	2	1.4	7	5.0
4. Asst. A.D.	0	0.0	3	2.1	0	0.0	5	3.5	3	2.1	11	7.8
5. Intramural Director	11	7.8	2	1.4	7	5.0	4	2.8	10	7.1	34	24.1
6. Assoc. Im. D.	3	2.1	0	0.0	2	1.4	0	0.0	2	1.4	7	5.0
7. Asst. Im. D.	17	12.1	4	2.8	1	0.7	0	0.0	1	0.7	23	16.3
TOTAL	40	28.4	14	9.9	15	10.6	18	12.8	54	38.3	141	100.0

χ^2 86.46030

χ^2 .95,24=36.415

χ^2 .99,24=42.980

Table 5
Chi Square Summary of Position Held by Administrators
Based on the Type of Institution

Administrative Position	Type of Institution					
	Public		Private		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. P.E. Chairperson	17	12.1	21	14.9	38	27.0
2. Athletic Director	8	5.7	13	9.2	21	14.9
3. Assoc. A.D.	4	2.8	3	2.1	7	5.0
4. Asst. A.D.	11	7.8	0	0.0	11	7.8
5. Intramural Director	17	12.1	17	12.1	34	24.1
6. Assoc. Im. D.	4	2.8	3	2.1	7	5.0
7. Asst. Im. D.	22	15.6	1	0.7	23	16.3
TOTAL	83	58.9	58	41.1	141	100.0
				χ^2 28.53561		
	χ^2 .95,6=12.592			χ^2 .99,6=16.812		

areas", e.g. home economics, nursing, and women's physical education" (p. 158). In reference to the athletic director's position, Geadelmann (1977) revealed that "women, who for some time, have voluntarily administered the embryonic intercollegiate athletic program for women have suddenly found themselves as 'assistant' athletic directors in combined departments and hence have been subtly removed from decision-making positions" (p. 18). Table 6 shows the position held based on the enrollment size of the institution.

Tenure status. Tenure has long been a controversial issue among both administrators and nonadministrators. Of the 83 administrators in public institutions, 32 (22.7%) were tenured and 51 (36.2%) were not tenured. The administrators in private institutions included 31 (22.0%) tenured and 27 (19.1%) non-tenured. Tenure was highest among physical education chairpersons; 31 (22.0%) were tenured. Table 7 reveals the tenure status of administrators based on the administrative position held.

Teaching time. Teaching time is important to administrators in that it gives them the needed touch with the practical situations. All administrators in both public and private institutions had some teaching responsibility, with the greatest amount existing in public institutions.

Table 6

Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to the Enrollment Size of the Institution Based on the Position Held

Administrative Position	Enrollment Size of Institution													
	4,999 & Below		5,000-9,999		10,000-14,999		15,000-19,999		20,000-24,999		25,000 & Above		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. P.E. Chairperson	22	15.6	11	7.8	1	0.7	2	1.4	2	1.4	0	0.0	38	27.0
2. Athletic Director	13	9.2	4	2.8	1	0.7	2	1.4	1	0.7	0	0.0	21	14.9
3. Assoc. A.D.	3	2.1	1	0.7	1	0.7	1	0.7	1	0.7	0	0.0	7	5.0
4. Asst. A.D.	0	0.0	2	1.4	2	1.4	0	0.0	3	2.1	4	2.8	11	7.8
5. Intramural Director	18	12.8	7	5.0	2	1.4	0	0.0	4	2.8	3	2.1	34	24.1
6. Assoc. Im. D.	1	0.7	2	1.4	1	0.7	0	0.0	1	0.7	2	1.4	7	5.0
7. Asst. Im. D.	2	1.4	2	1.4	5	3.5	5	3.5	6	4.3	3	2.1	23	16.3
TOTAL	59	41.8	29	20.6	13	9.2	10	7.1	18	12.8	12	8.5	141	100.0
χ^2 67.28028														
χ^2 .95, 30=43.773							χ^2 .99, 30=50.892							

Table 7
Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Tenure
Status Based on the Administrative Position Held

Administrative Position	Tenure Status					
	Yes		No		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. P.E. Chairperson	31	22.0	7	5.0	38	27.0
2. Athletic Director	9	6.4	12	8.5	21	4.9
3. Assoc. A.D.	4	2.8	3	2.1	7	5.0
4. Asst. A.D.	3	2.1	8	5.7	11	7.8
5. Intramural Director	14	9.9	20	14.2	34	24.1
6. Assoc. Im. D.	1	0.7	6	4.3	7	5.0
7. Asst. Im. D.	1	0.7	22	15.6	23	16.3
TOTAL	63	44.7	78	55.3	141	100.0
			χ^2 40.67076			
	χ^2 .95,6=12.592		χ^2 .99,6=16.812			

The administrators' responses to teaching time, based on the position held, are shown in Table 8.

Release time. The administrators in public institutions included 61 (43.3%) with 0% to 25% of release time. In private institutions 47 (33.3%) administrators had 0% to 25% of release time. Table 9 shows administrators' responses to release time based on the position held.

Acquisition of position. Research shows that very seldom do women become administrators without formal training in administration or through the buddy system. Benton (1980), in support of this statement, found that:

Because higher education institutions have been largely male dominated, so have the informal networks that developed within them. Consequently women have not been able to infiltrate the "old boy" network because women candidates lack visibility and are, therefore, rarely suggested for top-level positions. (p. 6)

In public institutions 34 (24.1%) administrators were promoted and 49 (34.8%) applied for their positions. In the private institutions, 35 (24.8%) administrators were promoted and 23 (16.3%) applied for their positions. Table 10 shows the responses of administrators to the acquisition of the position based on the position held.

Rank of administrators. The greatest number of administrators in public institutions ranked as staff and as

Table 8
 Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Teaching Time
 Based on the Administrative Position Held

	Percentage of Time Spent Teaching									
	0-25		26-50		51-75		76-100		100	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. P.E. Chairperson	6	4.3	11	7.8	11	7.8	10	7.1	38	27.0
2. Athletic Director	8	5.7	5	3.5	3	2.1	5	3.5	21	14.9
3. Assoc. A.D.	5	3.5	1	0.7	1	0.7	0	0.0	7	5.0
4. Asst. A.D.	11	7.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	11	7.8
5. Intramural Director	19	13.5	8	5.7	3	2.1	4	2.8	34	24.1
6. Assoc. Im. D.	5	3.5	0	0.0	1	0.7	1	0.7	7	5.0
7. Asst. Im. D.	21	14.9	2	1.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	23	16.3
TOTAL	75	53.2	27	19.1	19	13.5	20	14.2	141	100.0
					χ^2	53.12280				
	χ^2	.95,18=28.869			χ^2	.99,18=34.805				

Table 9

Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Release
Time Based on the Administrative Position Held

	Percentage of Release Time									
	0-25		26-50		51-75		76-100		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. P.E. Chairperson	23	16.3	7	5.0	7	5.0	1	0.7	38	27.0
2. Athletic Director	18	12.8	2	1.4	1	0.7	0	0.0	21	14.9
3. Assoc. A.D.	3	2.1	1	0.7	2	1.4	1	0.7	7	5.0
4. Asst. A.D.	10	7.1	0	0.0	1	0.7	0	0.0	11	7.8
5. Intramural Director	29	20.6	2	1.4	1	0.7	2	1.4	34	24.1
6. Assoc. Im. D.	5	3.5	1	0.7	0	0.0	1	0.7	7	5.0
7. Asst. Im. D.	20	14.2	2	1.4	0	0.0	1	0.7	23	16.3
TOTAL	108	76.6	15	10.6	12	8.5	6	4.3	141	100.0
					χ^2	24.82209				
	χ^2	.95,18=28.869			χ^2	.99,18=34.805				

Table 10

Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to How the Position
was Acquired Based on the Administrative Position Held

	How Position was Acquired					
	Promotion		Application		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. P.E. Chairperson	24	17.0	14	9.9	38	27.0
2. Athletic Director	11	7.8	10	7.1	21	14.9
3. Assoc. A.D.	6	4.3	1	0.7	7	5.0
4. Asst. A.D.	6	4.3	5	3.5	11	7.8
5. Intramural Director	14	9.9	20	14.2	34	24.1
6. Assoc. Im. D.	4	2.8	3	2.1	7	5.0
7. Asst. Im. D.	4	2.8	19	13.5	23	16.3
TOTAL	69	48.9	72	51.1	141	100.0
				χ^2 17.26981		
	χ^2 .95,6=12.592			χ^2 .99,6=16.812		

administrator, whereas in private institutions the greatest number of administrators ranked as assistant professors. Table 11 shows the responses of administrators to rank based on the position held.

Staff size. Staff sizes ranged from 0 to 72 in both public and private institutions. Research has shown that women rate high comparatively with male administrators. According to McCarthy and Webb (1977), "men who have worked under women administrators rank women as high or higher than their male counterparts" (p. 55). Table 12 shows the administrators' responses to staff size based on the administrative position held.

Type of institution. This item was used to determine the type of institution in which the administrators worked and to categorize the data. This information is shown in Table 5, based on the position held.

Enrollment. This was the third question used to categorize the data. The smaller the enrollment, in private institutions, the greater the number of administrators. In public institutions more administrators were in institutions with large enrollments.

Type of program. There were three types of programs listed in this item, men's program, women's program, and coeducational program. In public institutions 63 (44.7%) administrators were responsible for coeducational programs and only 20 (14.2%) administrators were responsible for

Table 11

Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Rank
Based on the Administrative Position Held

Administrative Position	Rank													
	Staff		Instructor		Asst. Professor		Assoc. Professor		Professor		Adminis- trator		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. P.E. Chairperson	1	0.7	1	0.7	8	5.7	12	8.5	16	11.3	0	0.0	38	27.0
2. Athletic Director	3	2.1	3	2.1	8	5.7	5	3.5	0	0.0	2	1.4	21	14.9
3. Assoc. A.D.	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7	3	2.1	0	0.0	3	2.1	7	5.0
4. Asst. A.D.	1	0.7	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	1.4	7	5.0	11	7.8
5. Intramural Director	8	5.7	4	2.8	9	6.4	5	3.5	2	1.4	6	4.3	34	24.1
6. Assoc. Im. D.	2	1.4	0	0.0	1	0.7	2	1.4	0	0.0	2	1.4	7	5.0
7. Asst. Im. D.	6	4.3	4	2.8	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	8.5	23	16.3
TOTAL	21	14.9	13	9.2	28	19.9	27	19.1	20	14.2	32	22.7	141	100.0

χ^2 97.03609

χ^2 .95, 30=43.773

χ^2 .99, 30=50.892

Table 12

Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Staff Size
Based on the Administrative Position Held

Administrative Position	Staff Size											
	0-5		6-10		11-15		16-20		21 & Above		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. P.E. Chairperson	11	7.8	12	8.5	3	2.1	6	4.3	6	4.3	38	27.0
2. Athletic Director	10	7.1	6	4.3	4	2.8	0	0.0	1	0.7	21	14.9
3. Assoc. A.D.	2	1.4	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	2.8	7	5.0
4. Asst. A.D.	2	1.4	1	0.7	2	1.4	2	1.4	4	2.8	11	7.8
5. Intramural Director	13	9.2	14	9.9	4	2.8	0	0.0	3	2.1	34	24.1
6. Assoc. Im. D.	3	2.1	3	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7	7	5.0
7. Asst. Im. D.	12	8.5	8	5.7	2	1.4	1	0.7	0	0.0	23	16.3
TOTAL	53	37.6	45	31.9	15	10.6	9	6.4	19	13.5	141	100.0
							χ^2	42.96544				
	χ^2	.95,24=36.415					χ^2	.99,24=42.980				

women's programs. In private institutions 32 (22.7%) administrators were responsible for coeducational programs and 26 (18.4%) administrators were responsible for women's programs. No women were responsible for men's programs in either public or private institutions.

Table 13 shows the administrators' responses to the type of program based on the administrative position held. Thirty (21.3%) physical education chairpersons were responsible for combined programs and 20 (14.2%) athletic directors were responsible for women's programs; 23 (16.3%) intramural directors worked with combined programs.

Salary range. Two responses were missing in this item. The salary range based on the enrollment size of the institution is shown in Table 14. Table 15 shows the administrators' responses to salary range based on the administrative position held. In public institutions 17 (12.1%) administrators were below \$15,000 and the remainder were above \$15,000. In private institutions 11 (7.8%) administrators were below \$15,000 and the remainder above \$15,000.

Administrative time. Most administrators, 41 (29.1%), had 76% to 100% of administrative time in public institutions. Forty-one (29.1%) administrators in private institutions had 0% to 25% administrative time. Table 16 shows the responses of administrators to administrative time based on the position held.

Table 13

Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to the Type of Program Based on the Administrative Position Held

Administrative Position	Type of Program					
	Women		Combined		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. P.E. Chairperson	8	5.7	30	21.3	38	27.0
2. Athletic Director	20	14.2	1	0.7	21	14.9
3. Assoc. A.D.	2	1.4	5	3.5	7	5.0
4. Asst. A.D.	4	2.8	7	5.0	11	7.8
5. Intramural Director	11	7.8	23	16.3	34	24.1
6. Assoc. Im. D.	0	0.0	7	5.0	7	5.0
7. Asst. Im. D.	1	0.7	22	15.6	23	16.3
TOTAL	46	32.6	95	67.4	141	100.0
				X^2 51.64972		
	X^2 .95,6=12.592			X^2 .99,6=16.812		

Table 14

Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Salary Range
Based on the Size of the Institution Enrollment

Enrollment	Salary Range									
	\$9,999 & Below		\$10,000-\$14,999		\$15,000-\$19,999		\$20,000-\$24,999		\$25,000-\$29,999	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. 4,999 & Below	2	1.4	12	8.6	31	22.3	8	5.8	5	3.6
2. 5,000-9,999	3	2.2	3	2.2	4	2.9	6	4.3	6	4.3
3. 10,000-14,999	1	0.7	4	2.9	3	2.2	3	2.2	1	0.7
4. 15,000-19,999	0	0.0	3	2.2	1	0.7	1	0.7	4	2.9
5. 20,000-24,999	0	0.0	2	1.4	8	5.8	3	2.2	1	0.7
6. 25,000 & Above	0	0.0	2	1.4	2	1.4	3	2.2	1	0.7
TOTAL	6	4.3	26	18.7	49	35.3	24	17.3	18	12.9

(table continues)

Table 14 (Continued)

Enrollment	Salary Range						Total	
	\$30,000- \$34,999		\$35,000- \$39,999		\$40,000 & Above		N	%
	N	%	N	%	N	%		
1. 4,999 & Below	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	59	42.4
2. 5,000-9,999	5	3.6	2	1.4	0	0.0	29	20.9
3. 10,000-14,999	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	8.6
4. 15,000-19,999	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	7.2
5. 20,000-24,999	3	2.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	17	12.2
6. 25,000 & Above	2	1.4	1	0.7	1	0.7	12	8.6
TOTAL	12	8.6	3	2.2	1	0.7	139*	100.0
				χ^2 59.11359				*2 missing
	χ^2 .95, 35=49.802			χ^2 2.99, 35=57.342				

Table 15

Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Salary Range
Based on the Administrative Position Held

Administrative Position	Salary Range									
	\$9,999 & Below		\$10,000- \$14,999		\$15,000- \$19,999		\$20,000- \$24,999		\$25,000- \$29,999	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. P.E. Chairperson	0	0.0	1	0.7	14	10.1	8	5.8	5	3.6
2. Athletic Director	1	0.7	4	2.9	8	5.8	2	1.4	6	4.3
3. Assoc. A.D.	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7	3	2.2	2	1.4
4. Asst. A.D.	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7	2	1.4	3	2.2
5. Intramural Director	5	3.6	7	5.0	15	10.8	4	2.9	1	0.7
6. Assoc. Im. D.	0	0.0	2	1.4	3	2.2	2	1.4	0	0.0
7. Asst. Im. D.	0	0.0	12	8.6	7	5.0	3	2.2	1	0.7
TOTAL	6	4.3	26	18.7	49	35.3	24	17.3	18	12.9

(table continues)

Table 15 (Continued)

Administrative Position	Salary Range							
	\$30,000- \$34,999		\$35,000- \$39,999		\$40,000 & Above		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. P.E. Chairperson	7	5.0	2	1.4	0	0.0	37*	26.0
2. Athletic Director	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	21	15.1
3. Assoc. A.D.	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	5.0
4. Asst. A.D.	3	2.2	1	0.7	0	0.0	10*	7.2
5. Intramural Director	1	0.7	0	0.0	1	0.7	34	24.5
6. Assoc. Im. D.	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	5.0
7. Asst. Im. D.	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	23	16.5
TOTAL	12	8.6	3	2.2	1	0.7	139	100.0
							*2 missing	
				χ^2	81.46907			
χ^2	.95,42=58.124				χ^2	.99,42=66.206		

Table 16

Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Administrative Time Based on the Administrative Position Held

Administrative Position	Percentage of Administrative Time										
	0-25		26-50		51-75		76-100		Total		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
1. P.E. Chairperson	26	18.4	5	3.5	5	3.5	2	1.4	38	27.0	
2. Athletic Director	12	8.5	4	2.8	2	1.4	3	2.1	21	14.9	
3. Assoc. A.D.	2	1.4	0	0.0	2	1.4	3	2.1	7	5.0	
4. Asst. A.D.	2	1.4	3	2.1	0	0.0	6	4.3	11	7.8	
5. Intramural Director	15	10.6	6	4.3	1	0.7	12	8.5	34	24.1	
6. Assoc. Im. D.	3	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	2.8	7	5.0	
7. Asst. Im. D.	1	0.7	3	2.1	1	0.7	18	12.8	23	16.3	
TOTAL	61	43.3	21	14.9	11	7.8	48	34.0	141	100.0	
					X^2 .99,18=34.805						
X^2 .95,18=28.869				X^2 .99,18=34.805							

Section II: Administrative Responsibility

Each administrator was asked to indicate the amount of responsibility they had in the following eight areas: (a) planning, (b) organizing, (c) staffing, (d) directing, (e) coordinating, (f) dean reporting, (g) chairperson reporting, and (h) budgeting. The administrators' responses are discussed in the following paragraphs.

Planning. Public institution administrators reported that 55 (39.0%) had total responsibility and 28 (19.9%) reported being responsible for planning programs only sometimes. At private institutions 37 (26.2%) administrators were totally responsible and 19 (13.5%) reported being responsible for planning programs sometimes. Planning responsibilities varied, percentage wise, when based on the enrollment size of the institution. Table 17 shows the distribution of planning responsibility based on the position held by administrators.

Organizing. Forty-eight (34.0%) administrators at public institutions were totally responsible for organizing and 35 (24.8%) administrators were responsible sometimes for organizing. In private institutions 32 (22.7%) administrators were totally responsible for organizing and 21 (14.9%) administrators were responsible for organizing only sometimes. Those who were never responsible for organizing their programs were in top administrative positions in institutions with enrollments of 4,999 and below with the

Table 17

Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Planning
 Based on the Administrative Position Held

Administrative Position	Amount of Responsibility									
	Total		Sometimes		Never			Total		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
1. P.E. Chairperson	24	17.0	14	9.9	0	0.0	38	27.0		
2. Athletic Director	12	8.5	7	5.0	2	1.4	21	14.9		
3. Assoc. A.D.	2	1.4	5	3.5	0	0.0	7	5.0		
4. Asst. A.D.	8	5.7	3	2.1	0	0.0	11	7.8		
5. Intramural Director	26	18.4	8	5.7	0	0.0	34	21.1		
6. Assoc. Im. Director	6	4.3	1	0.7	0	0.0	7	5.0		
7. Asst. Im. Director	14	9.9	9	6.4	0	0.0	25	16.3		
TOTAL	92	65.2	47	33.3	2	1.4	141	100.0		
					$\chi^2 19.65949$					
$\chi^2 .95, 12=21.026$					$\chi^2 .99, 12=26.217$					

exception of one administrator. Table 18 shows the distribution of organizing responsibility of administrators based on the position held.

Staffing. At public institutions 41 (29.1%) administrators had total responsibility for staffing and 38 (27.0%) administrators were responsible sometimes for staffing. Of the 58 administrators in private institutions, 24 (17.0%) had total responsibility for staffing and 23 (16.3%) were responsible sometimes for staffing. Table 19 shows the staffing responsibility of administrators based on the administrative position held.

Directing. Fifty-five (39.0%) administrators had total responsibility for directing and 27 (19.1%) administrators were sometimes responsible for directing their programs in public institutions. In private institutions 31 (22.0%) administrators were totally responsible for directing and 23 (16.3%) administrators were responsible sometimes for directing the program. Table 20 shows the distribution of directing responsibility of administrators based on the position held.

Coordinating. In public institutions 51 (36.4%) administrators were totally responsible for coordinating and 29 (20.7%) administrators responsible for coordinating sometimes. Of the 58 administrators at private institutions, 37 (26.4%) were totally responsible and 19 (13.6%) were responsible sometimes for coordinating their program. In

Table 18

Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Organizing
Based on the Administrative Position Held

Administrative Position	Amount of Responsibility						Total	
	Total		Sometimes		Never			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. P.E. Chairperson	21	14.9	15	10.6	2	1.4	38	27.0
2. Athletic Director	10	7.1	9	6.4	2	1.4	21	14.9
3. Assoc. A.D.	3	2.1	4	2.8	0	0.0	7	5.0
4. Asst. A.D.	6	4.3	5	3.5	0	0.0	11	7.8
5. Intramural Director	23	16.3	10	7.1	1	0.7	34	24.1
6. Assoc. Im. Director	5	3.5	2	1.4	0	0.0	7	5.0
7. Asst. Im. Director	12	8.5	11	7.8	0	0.0	23	16.3
TOTAL	80	56.7	56	39.7	5	3.5	141	100.0

$$X^2 = 7.99046$$

$$X^2 .95,12=21.026$$

$$X^2 .99,12=26.217$$

Table 19

Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Staffing
Based on the Administrative Position Held

	Amount of Responsibility							
	Total		Sometimes		Never		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. P.E. Chairperson	15	10.6	20	14.2	3	2.1	38	27.0
2. Athletic Director	5	3.5	9	6.4	7	5.0	21	14.9
3. Assoc. A.D.	2	1.4	5	3.5	0	0.0	7	5.0
4. Asst. A.D.	6	4.3	5	3.5	0	0.0	11	7.8
5. Intramural Director	24	17.0	7	5.0	3	2.1	34	24.1
6. Assoc. Im. Director	3	2.1	3	2.1	1	0.7	7	5.0
7. Asst. Im. Director	10	7.1	12	8.5	1	0.7	23	16.3
TOTAL	65	46.1	61	43.3	15	10.6	141	100.0
					χ^2 27.66524			

χ^2 .95,12=21.026

χ^2 .99,12=26.217

Table 20
 Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Directing
 Based on the Administrative Position Held

Administrative Position	Amount of Responsibility							
	Total		Sometimes		Never		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. P.E. Chairperson	24	17.0	13	9.2	1	0.7	38	27.0
2. Athletic Director	9	6.4	9	6.4	3	2.1	21	14.9
3. Assoc. A.D.	2	1.4	5	3.5	0	0.0	7	5.0
4. Asst. A.D.	6	4.3	5	3.5	0	0.0	11	7.8
5. Intramural Director	27	19.1	6	4.3	1	0.7	34	24.1
6. Assoc. Im. Director	5	3.5	2	1.4	0	0.0	7	5.0
7. Asst. Im. Director	13	9.2	10	7.1	0	0.0	23	16.3
TOTAL	86	61.0	50	35.5	5	3.5	141	100.0
					χ^2 19.94915			
	χ^2 .95,12=21.026			χ^2 .99,12=26.217				

Table 21 the administrative responsibility of coordinating is based on the administrative position held.

Dean reporting. In public institutions 35 (24.8%) administrators were totally responsible and 35 (24.8%) administrators were sometimes responsible for dean reporting. In private institutions 36 (25.5%) administrators were totally responsible and 17 (12.1%) administrators were sometimes responsible for dean reporting. Table 22 shows the distribution of dean reporting responses based on the position of the administrator.

Chairperson reporting. Forty-four (31.7%) administrators were totally responsible and 29 (20.9%) administrators were responsible sometimes for chairperson reporting in public institutions. Administrators in private institutions included 32 (23.0%) who were totally responsible and 14 (10.1%) who were responsible sometimes for chairperson reporting. In Table 23 the responses to chairperson reporting are based on the administrative position held.

Budgeting. In public institutions 38 (27.0%) administrators were totally responsible and 31 (22.0%) administrators were responsible sometimes for budgeting. Administrators in private institutions reported that 34 (24.1%) were totally responsible and 15 (10.6%) were responsible sometimes for budgeting. Table 24 shows the responses of the various administrators to the responsibility of budgeting.

Table 21
Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Coordinating
Based on the Administrative Position Held

Administrative Position	Amount of Responsibility							
	Total		Sometimes		Never		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. P.E. Chairperson	25	17.9	12	8.6	0	0.0	37	26.4
2. Athletic Director	12	8.6	7	5.0	2	1.4	21	15.0
3. Assoc. A.D.	2	1.4	5	3.6	0	0.0	7	5.0
4. Asst. A.D.	8	5.7	3	2.1	0	0.0	11	7.9
5. Intramural Director	27	19.3	3	2.1	1	0.7	34	24.3
6. Assoc. Im. Director	3	2.1	4	2.9	0	0.0	7	5.0
7. Asst. Im. Director	11	7.9	11	7.9	1	0.7	23	16.4
TOTAL	88	62.9	48	34.3	4	2.9	140 ^a	100.0
				χ^2 17.75069				

χ^2 .95,12=21.026

χ^2 .99,12=26.217

^aOne missing.

Table 22

Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Dean
Reporting Based on the Administrative Position Held

Administrative Position	Amount of Responsibility							
	Total		Sometimes		Never		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. P.E. Chairperson	28	19.9	9	6.4	1	0.7	38	27.0
2. Athletic Director	9	6.4	9	6.4	3	2.1	21	14.9
3. Assoc. A.D.	2	1.4	4	2.8	1	0.7	7	5.0
4. Asst. A.D.	4	2.8	6	4.3	1	0.7	11	7.8
5. Intramural Director	19	13.5	9	6.4	6	4.3	34	24.3
6. Assoc. Im. Director	3	2.1	3	2.1	1	0.7	7	5.0
7. Asst. Im. Director	6	4.3	12	8.5	5	3.5	23	16.3
TOTAL	71	50.4	52	36.9	18	12.8	141	100.0

χ^2 19.95879

χ^2 .95,12=21.026

χ^2 .99,12=26.217

Table 23

Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Chairperson
Reporting Based on the Administrative Position Held

Administrative Position	Amount of Responsibility						Total	
	Total		Sometimes		Never		N	%
	N	%	N	%	N	%		
1. P.E. Chairperson	17	12.2	9	6.5	10	7.2	36	25.9
2. Athletic Director	10	7.2	5	3.5	6	4.3	21	15.1
3. Assoc. A.D.	4	2.9	3	2.2	0	0.0	7	5.0
4. Asst. A.D.	6	4.3	4	2.9	1	0.7	11	7.9
5. Intramural Director	20	14.4	11	7.9	3	2.2	34	24.5
6. Assoc. Im. Director	6	4.3	1	0.7	0	0.0	7	5.0
7. Asst. Im. Director	13	9.4	10	7.2	0	0.0	23	16.5
TOTAL	76	54.7	43	30.9	20	14.4	139 ^a	100.0

χ^2 18.61104

χ^2 .95,12=21.026

χ^2 .99,12=26.217

^aTwo missing

Table 24

Chi Square Summary of Administrators' Responses to Budgeting
Based on the Administrative Position Held

Administrative Position	Amount of Responsibility								
	Total		Sometimes		Never		Total		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
1. P.E. Chairperson	24	17.6	10	7.1	4	2.8	38	27.0	
2. Athletic Director	12	8.5	8	5.7	1	0.7	21	14.9	
3. Assoc. A.D.	3	2.1	3	2.1	1	0.7	7	5.0	
4. Asst. A.D.	5	3.5	5	3.5	1	0.7	11	7.8	
5. Intramural Director	17	12.1	7	5.0	10	7.1	34	24.1	
6. Assoc. Im. Director	1	0.7	3	2.1	3	2.1	7	5.0	
7. Asst. Im. Director	10	7.1	10	7.1	3	2.1	23	16.3	
TOTAL	72	51.1	46	32.6	23	16.3	141	100.0	
					χ^2 17.14020				
	χ^2 .95,12=21.026		χ^2 .99,12=26.217						

In summary, Table 25 indicates that 65.2% of the administrators had total responsibility for planning; 62.9% for coordinating; 61% for directing; 56.7% for organizing; 54.7% for chairperson reporting; 51.1% for budgeting; 50.4% for dean reporting; and 46.1% for staffing. The lowest percentages of responsibility for all duties are in the "never" column.

Summary

Chapter IV dealt with the analyses of the data and discussion of the results. The discussion included the procedure used to collect the data and the statistical procedures used in analyzing the data in this study. This chapter, through tables (1-25), gave the reader a numerical view of the administrators' responses to the questionnaire items.

The following chapter will summarize the previous chapters in this study. Chapter V will also include the findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

Table 25

Summary of Administrators' Responses and Percentages of Total Responses to the Eight Areas of Administrative Responsibility

Administrative Duty	Amount of Responsibility						Total	
	Total		Sometimes		Never		N	%
	N	%	N	%	N	%		
1. Planning	92	65.2	47	33.3	2	1.4	141	100.0
2. Organizing	80	56.7	56	39.7	5	3.5	141	100.0
3. Staffing	65	46.1	61	43.3	15	10.6	141	100.0
4. Directing	86	61.0	50	35.5	5	3.5	141	100.0
5. Coordinating	88	62.9	48	34.3	4	2.9	140 ^a	100.0
6. Reporting/Dean	71	50.4	52	36.9	18	12.8	141	100.0
7. Reporting/Chairperson	76	54.7	43	30.9	20	14.4	139 ^b	100.0
8. Budgeting	72	51.1	46	32.6	23	16.3	141	100.0

^aOne missing response

^bTwo missing responses

Chapter V
Summary, Findings, Conclusions,
and Recommendations

Summary

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the administrative status of selected women physical educators in 13 southern states. An inquiry was made to obtain the mailing list through the use of The 1981-82 National Directory of College Athletics and The 1981 National Intramural Recreational Sports Directory. A questionnaire was developed by the investigator through the study of related literature, and recommendations of the graduate committee.

A two-part questionnaire was mailed to a population of 277 women physical education administrators. Of the total surveyed, 141 (51.0%) were returned and deemed usable in this study. Nonresponding administrators totaled 133 (49.0%). The responses were tallied and programmed in the Honeywell Computer at Middle Tennessee State University. The collected data responses were analyzed using the Cross Tabs program and reported in terms of raw scores and percentages.

Findings

The collected data revealed the following findings in this study of selected women administrators in physical

education. A breakdown according to race was as follows: 133 (94.3%) of the administrators were white Americans, 5 (3.5%) black Americans, 1 (.7%) American Indian, 1 (.7%) Oriental American, and 1 (.7%) Spanish American. Relative to the highest degree held, 93 (66.4%) administrators held masters, followed by 31 (22.1%) doctoral degrees, 11 (7.9%) bachelors, and 5 (3.6%) specialist degree holders.

The age range of these administrators revealed that 43 (30.5%) were in the 21 to 30 year range which included mostly sports administrators; 36 (25.6%) were in the 41 to 50 year range; 33 (23.4%) were in the 31 to 40 year range; 25 (17.7%) were in the 51 to 60 year range; and 4 (2.8%) were in the 61 and above range.

Based on the position held, there were 38 (27.0%) physical education chairpersons, 21 (14.9%) athletic directors, 7 (7.8%) associate athletic directors, 11 (7.8%) assistant athletic directors, 34 (24.1%) intramural directors, 7 (5.0%) associate intramural directors, and 23 (16.3%) assistant intramural directors. Of the 141 administrators, 78 (55.3%) were tenured and 68 (44.7%) were not tenured. A high percentage of physical education chairpersons were tenured and very few sports administrators were tenured.

The results showed that all administrators had some teaching responsibility; 75 (52.2%) had 0% to 25%; 27 (19.1%) had 26% to 50%; 19 (13.5%) had 51% to 75%; and 20

(14.2%) with 76% to 100%. The release time was highest in the 0% to 25% category which included 108 (76.6%) administrators.

In reference to how the administrative position was acquired, 72 (51.1%) administrators applied, with only 69 (48.9%) being promoted from within. These administrators ranked from staff to administrator with 32 (22.7%) administrators; 28 (19.9%) assistant professors; 27 (19.1%) associate professors; 21 (14.9%) staff; 20 (14.2%) professors; and 13 (9.2%) instructors.

The staff size of administrators ranged from 53 (37.6%) with 0 to 5; 45 (31.9%) with 6 to 10; 19 (13.5%) with 11 to 15; and 9 (6.4%) with 16 to 20 staff members. Of this number, 83 (58.9%) were administrators in public institutions, and 58 (41.1%) were administrators in private institutions.

The greatest number of administrators, 59 (41.8%), were in institutions with enrollments of 4,999 and below, followed by 29 (20.6%) administrators in institutions with enrollments of 5,000 to 9,999. The type of programs directed by administrators in these institutions included 95 (67.4%) who worked with coeducational programs and 46 (32.6%) who worked with women's programs.

One (0.7%) administrator was in the \$40,000 and above salary range; 3 (2.2%) in the \$35,000 to \$39,999 range; 12 (8.6%) in the \$30,000 to \$34,999 range; 18 (12.9%) in the

\$25,000 to \$29,000 range; 24 (17.3%) in the \$20,000 to \$24,999 range; 49 (35.3%) in the \$15,000 to \$19,999 range; and 26 (18.7%) in the \$10,000 to \$14,999 salary range.

All administrators reported having some administrative time which included 61 (43.3%) with 0% to 25%; 48 (34.0%) with 76% to 100%; 21 (14.9%) with 26% to 50%; and 11 (7.8%) with 51% to 75% of administrative time.

The administrators' responses to the eight areas of administrative responsibility are as follows: Fifty percent of the administrators indicated having total responsibility for planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, dean reporting, chairperson reporting, and budgeting their programs. Thirty percent of the administrators were sometimes responsible for planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, dean reporting, chairperson reporting, and budgeting their programs.

Conclusions

The data were obtained from women physical education administrators in 13 southern states. Based upon the findings of this study, the following conclusions were made:

1. The administrators' ages ranged from 21 to 61 and above. It was concluded that there was no age limit relative to women becoming administrators.

2. Since 94.3% of all administrators were white, it was concluded that white women were more successful in attaining administrative positions than nonwhite women.

3. Only one (.07%) administrator indicated that she was an American Indian and 133 (94.3%) wrote, in the space provided on the questionnaire, that they were white or Caucasian. It was concluded that most administrators were unaware of the connotation of American Indian in both public and private institutions because of their written responses.

4. Since 66.4% of the women held master's degrees and 22.1% held doctoral degrees, this indicated that a master's degree or higher was a prerequisite for administrative positions.

5. Women physical educators in top administrative positions had 21 to 41 years of experience. Thus, the women with the most experience held higher positions than women with less than 21 years of experience.

6. The higher the age range, the higher the position held relative to physical education chairpersons and the opposite was true relative to administrators of athletic programs and intramural programs.

7. Two-thirds of the women held top administrative positions (physical education chairperson, athletic director, and intramural director) with the remaining one-third in associate (10.0%) and assistant (24.1%) positions in sports programs. It was concluded that women physical education administrators have titles that imply some administrative responsibility.

8. Since 44.7% of the administrators were tenured, with 38.3% of these holding top positions (22.0% were physical education chairpersons; 6.4% were athletic directors; and 9.9% were intramural directors), it was concluded that tenure is more attainable in top-level positions than in the lower positions (associate or assistant).

9. Women physical education administrators gained their status through application (51.1%) and promotion (48.9%). It was concluded that women's chances of acquiring administrative positions were about the same via application as through promotion.

10. No women were responsible for men's programs, but 67.4% were responsible for coeducational programs, with only 32.6% responsible for women's programs. The conclusions drawn are twofold: (a) women's chances of becoming administrators of men's programs are very slim; and (b) more women are responsible for coeducational programs than women's programs.

11. Since 70.0% of the women acquired their positions following the issuance of Title IX, it was concluded that Title IX was an influential factor in women being considered for administrative positions in physical education.

12. The greatest percentage of administrators (35.3%) was in the \$15,000 to \$19,999 salary range. It was

concluded that the salary ranges of administrators are about the same in the positions of physical education chairpersons, athletic directors, and intramural directors in both public and private institutions.

13. The smaller the enrollment of the institution, the greater the administrative responsibility.

14. The administrative status of women physical educators is high because over 50.0% indicated having total responsibility for planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting (deans/chairpersons), and budgeting.

15. There were relationships, based on the Chi Square at the .05 level of significance, between the administrative position held by women physical educators and the following: (a) age range, (b) highest degree held, (c) experience, (d) type of institution, (e) enrollment size of institution, (f) tenure, (g) teaching time, (h) how the position was acquired, (i) rank, (j) staff size, (k) type of program, (l) salary range, (m) administrative time, and (n) the administrative responsibility of staffing. (This was included because the computer provided this information to the investigator.)

Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the investigator made the following recommendations:

1. That a study using only the top administrators be conducted separate from those in associate and assistant positions.

2. That a study using only men administrators in physical education within SDAAPERD be conducted and compared to this study.

3. That this study be updated every 5 years.

4. That a similar study be done in another district and compared to this study.

Based on the administrators' responses to certain questionnaire items, the following recommendations were made:

5. The term "American Indian" used in Item 2 be changed to Caucasian or white American.

6. The number of years of experience should be set up in a range of 5-year intervals instead of a write-in response in Item 5.

7. The staff size should be set up in intervals of 5 instead of a write-in response in Item 12.

8. The space allowed for comments, Items 26 to 29, on the questionnaire should be eliminated because of a lack of written responses.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A
COVER LETTER

MIDDLE TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

Murfreesboro, Tennessee 37132

Health, Physical Education, Recreation
and Safety Department

Dear Colleague:

"Administrative Status" is a concern of many professionals, particularly women, in the field of physical education including both intramurals and athletics. Although research has been conducted to determine the status of administrators in other areas, little or no research has been conducted which addresses the administrative status of women physical educators.

With your assistance and cooperation, I would like to conduct a study in order to determine the administrative status of women within the areas of physical education, intramurals and athletics. The topic of the study is: "The Administrative Status of Selected Women Physical Educators in Thirteen Southern States."

It is hoped that through our collective efforts the results of this study may be utilized to provide more insight relative to those factors which affect the administrative status of women within the areas of physical education, intramurals, and athletics.

If you are a woman administrator in physical education, intramurals or athletics, please complete and return the enclosed survey. A self-addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

I realize that you are busy, but I would appreciate your professional assistance in returning the requested information as soon as possible. The results of this study will be available to you upon request. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Professionally yours,

Peggy Green
Doctoral Student
Department of Physical Education
Middle Tennessee State University

APPENDIX B
QUESTIONNAIRE

ADMINISTRATIVE STATUS SURVEY

Instructions: Please complete and return the following form if you are presently employed in an administrative position in physical education, intramurals, or athletics (chairperson, director, associate director or assistant director). Please check (___No) if this questionnaire does not apply to you and return it. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Part I:

Name _____
 Last First Middle or maiden init.

1. Indicate your gender by placing a (✓) in the appropriate space.

___ Female ___ Male

2. Indicate your age range by placing a (✓) in the appropriate space.

___ 21 to 30 years ___ 51 to 60 years
 ___ 31 to 40 years ___ 61 and above
 ___ 41 to 50 years

3. Indicate your race by placing a (✓) in the appropriate space.

___ American Indian ___ Oriental American
 ___ Black American ___ Spanish American
 Other _____
 (specify)

4. Indicate the highest degree held by placing a (✓) in the appropriate space.

_____ year obtained

___ Bachelor's Degree ___ Specialist Degree
 ___ Master's Degree ___ Doctoral Degree
 Other _____
 (specify)

5. Please indicate the amount of experience that you have.

____ Teaching/Administration

6. Give the title of your position and the year you started this position.

Title of position

Starting year

7. Are you tenured?

____ Yes ____ No

8. What percentage of teaching responsibility do you have in this position?

____ 0 - 25%

____ 51 - 75%

____ 26 - 50%

____ 76 - 100%

9. What percentage of release time do you have?

____ 0 - 25%

____ 51 - 75%

____ 26 - 50%

____ 76 - 100%

10. Indicate how you acquired this position by placing a (✓) in the appropriate space.

____ Promotion

____ Application (Hired)

11. Indicate your rank by placing a (✓) in the appropriate space.

____ Staff

____ Associate professor

____ Instructor

____ Professor

____ Assistant professor

____ Administrator

12. Indicate your staff size _____.

13. Give the name of your institution and indicate the type by placing a (✓) in the appropriate space.

Name of institution

____ public

____ private

14. Indicate the enrollment of the institution by placing a (✓) in the appropriate space.

<u> </u> 4,999 and below	<u> </u> 15,000 - 19,999
<u> </u> 5,000 - 9,999	<u> </u> 20,000 - 24,999
<u> </u> 10,000 - 14,999	<u> </u> 25,000 and above

15. Indicate the type of program for which you are responsible by placing a (✓) in the appropriate space.

 Separate (men women) Combined

16. Indicate your salary range by placing a (✓) in the appropriate space.

<u> </u> 9,999 and below	<u> </u> 25,000 - 29,999
<u> </u> 10,000 - 14,999	<u> </u> 30,000 - 34,999
<u> </u> 15,000 - 19,999	<u> </u> 35,000 - 39,999
<u> </u> 20,000 - 24,000	<u> </u> 40,000 and above

17. What percentage of your salary is allocated for administrative responsibility?

<u> </u> 0 - 25%	<u> </u> 51 - 75%
<u> </u> 26 - 50%	<u> </u> 76 - 100%

ADMINISTRATIVE DUTY SCALE

Part II: Please select (✓) the number that corresponds to the statement for each duty which identifies the amount of responsibility that you have as an administrator.

1. Total Responsibility
2. Sometimes Responsible
3. Never Responsible

Administrative Duties	Amount of Responsibility			Comments
	1	2	3	
1. <u>Planning</u> --is the process of outlining the work that is to be performed in a logical and purposeful manner, together with methods that are to be used in the performance of this work.				
2. <u>Organizing</u> --refers to the development of the formal structure of the organization, whereby the various administrative coordinating centers and subdivisions of work are arranged in an integrated manner, with clearly defined lines of authority.				
3. <u>Staffing</u> --refers to the entire personnel function of selection, assignment, training, and providing and maintaining favorable working conditions for all members of the organization.				
4. <u>Directing (Leading)</u> --is a responsibility of the administrator as a leader and must direct the operations of the organization. Guiding others toward established goals. Supervising.				

Administrative Duties	Amount of Responsibility			Comments
	1	2	3	
5. <u>Coordinating</u> --means inter-relating all the various phases of work within an organization and includes organizational communications.				
6. <u>Reporting</u> information to a dean, vice president, higher authority, or other group(s).				
7. <u>Reporting</u> information to a department chairperson, director or other group(s).				
8. <u>Budgeting</u> --refers to financial planning and accounting. It is the duty of the administrator to allocate to various subdivisions the general funds allotted to the organization.				
<u>Others</u> --(specify)				
9. _____				
10. _____				
11. _____				
12. _____				

Would you like to have a copy of the results of this study? Yes No

APPENDIX C
FOLLOW-UP LETTER

MIDDLE TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

Murfreesboro, Tennessee 37132

Health, Physical Education, Recreation
and Safety Department

Dear Administrator:

You were recently mailed a survey for assessing the administrative status of women in physical education, intramurals and athletics. It is very possible that you have not had time to complete the survey. Although time is valuable, I would be very appreciative of your assistance in completing and returning the survey as soon as possible. Thank you again for your professional interest and assistance in this study.

Professionally yours,

Peggy Green, Doctoral Student
Department of Physical
Education
Middle Tennessee State
University

APPENDIX D
SUMMARY OF ADMINISTRATORS' RESPONSES TO
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS BASED ON THE
TYPE OF INSTITUTION

Questionnaire Item	Responses Based on the Type of Institution					
	Public		Private		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Gender						
A. Female	83	58.9	58	41.1	141	100.0
2. Age Range						
A. 21-30 yrs.	27	19.1	16	11.3	43	30.5
B. 31-40 yrs.	23	16.3	10	7.1	33	23.4
C. 41-50 yrs.	14	9.9	22	15.6	36	25.5
D. 51-60 yrs.	16	11.3	9	6.4	25	17.7
E. 61 & above	03	2.1	1	0.7	4	2.8
Total	83	58.9	58	41.1	141	100.0
3. Race						
A. Amer. Indian	00	0.0	01	0.7	1	0.7
B. Black American	04	2.8	01	0.7	5	3.5
C. Oriental Amer.	01	0.7	00	0.0	1	0.7
D. Spanish Amer.	01	0.7	00	0.0	1	0.7
E. White/Cau.	77	54.6	56	39.7	133	94.3
Total	83	58.9	58	41.1	141	100.0
4. Highest Degree						
A. Bachelor	05	3.6	06	4.3	11	7.9
B. Master	53	37.9	40	28.6	93	66.4
C. Specialist	01	0.7	04	2.9	5	3.6
D. Doctoral	24	17.1	07	5.0	31	22.1
Total	83	58.9	57	40.7	140	100.0
5. Experience						
A. 0- 5 years	27	19.1	13	9.2	40	28.4
B. 6-10 years	08	5.7	06	4.3	14	9.9
C. 11-15 years	08	5.7	07	5.0	15	10.6
D. 16-20 years	15	10.6	03	2.1	18	12.8
E. 21-41 years	25	17.7	29	20.6	54	38.3
Total	83	58.9	58	41.1	141	100.0
6. Position Held						
A. P.E. Chair- person	17	12.1	21	14.9	38	27.0
B. Athletic Dir.	08	5.7	13	9.2	21	14.9
C. Assoc. A.D.	04	2.8	03	2.1	7	5.0
D. Asst. A.D.	11	7.8	00	0.0	11	7.8
E. Intramural Dir.	17	12.1	17	12.1	34	24.1
F. Assoc. Int. Dir.	04	2.8	03	2.1	7	5.0
G. Asst. Int. Dir.	22	15.6	01	0.7	23	16.3
Total	83	58.9	58	41.1	141	100.0

Questionnaire Item	Responses Based on the Type of Institution					
	Public		Private		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
7. Tenure						
A. Yes	32	22.7	31	22.0	63	44.7
B. No	51	36.2	27	19.1	78	55.3
Total	83	58.9	58	41.1	141	100.0
8. Teaching Time						
A. 0- 25 %	59	41.8	16	11.3	75	53.2
B. 26- 50 %	13	9.2	14	9.9	27	19.1
C. 51- 75 %	07	5.0	12	8.5	19	13.5
D. 76-100 %	04	2.8	16	11.3	20	14.2
Total	83	58.9	58	41.1	141	100.0
9. Release Time						
A. 0- 25 %	61	43.3	47	33.3	108	76.6
B. 26- 50 %	07	5.0	07	5.7	15	10.6
C. 51- 75 %	09	6.4	03	2.1	12	8.5
D. 75-100 %	06	4.3	00	0.0	6	4.3
Total	83	58.9	58	41.1	141	100.0
10. Acquired Position						
A. Promotion	34	24.1	35	24.8	69	48.9
B. Application	49	34.8	23	16.3	72	51.1
Total	83	58.9	58	41.1	141	100.0
11. Rank						
A. Staff	12	8.5	09	6.4	21	14.9
B. Instructor	08	5.7	05	3.5	13	9.2
C. Asst. Prof.	08	5.7	20	14.2	28	19.9
D. Assoc. Prof.	09	6.4	18	12.8	27	19.1
E. Professor	17	12.1	03	2.1	20	14.2
F. Administrator	29	20.6	03	2.1	32	22.7
Total	83	58.9	58	41.1	141	100.0
12. Staff Size						
A. 0- 5	26	18.4	27	19.1	53	37.6
B. 6-10	21	14.9	24	17.0	45	31.9
C. 11-15	11	7.8	04	2.8	15	10.6
D. 16-20	06	4.3	03	2.1	9	6.4
E. 21-72	19	13.5	00	0.0	19	13.5
Total	83	58.9	58	41.1	141	100.0

Questionnaire Item	Responses Based on the Type of Institution					
	Public		Private		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
14. Enrollment						
A. 4,999 & Below	10	7.1	49	34.8	59	41.8
B. 5,000-9,999	21	14.9	08	5.7	29	20.6
C. 10,000-14,999	13	9.2	00	0.0	13	9.2
D. 15,000-19,999	10	7.1	00	0.0	10	7.1
E. 20,000-24,999	18	12.8	00	0.0	18	12.8
F. 25,000 & Above	<u>11</u>	<u>7.8</u>	<u>01</u>	<u>0.7</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>8.5</u>
Total	<u>83</u>	<u>58.9</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>41.1</u>	<u>141</u>	<u>100.0</u>
15. Type of Program						
A. Men	0	0.0	0	0.0	00	0.0
B. Women	20	14.2	26	18.4	46	32.6
C. Co-ed.	<u>63</u>	<u>44.7</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>22.7</u>	<u>95</u>	<u>67.4</u>
Total	<u>83</u>	<u>58.9</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>41.1</u>	<u>141</u>	<u>100.0</u>
16. Salary Range						
A. \$ 9,999 & Below	02	1.4	04	2.9	6	4.3
B. \$10,000-14,999	15	10.8	11	7.9	26	18.7
C. \$15,000-19,999	20	14.4	29	20.9	49	35.3
D. \$20,000-24,999	13	9.4	11	7.9	24	17.3
E. \$25,000-29,999	15	10.8	03	2.2	18	12.9
F. \$30,000-34,999	12	8.6	00	0.0	12	8.6
G. \$35,000-39,999	03	2.2	00	0.0	3	2.2
H. \$40,000 & Above	<u>01</u>	<u>0.7</u>	<u>00</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>0.7</u>
Total	<u>81</u>	<u>58.3</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>41.1</u>	<u>139*</u>	<u>100.0</u>
17. Administrative Time						
A. 0- 25 %	20	14.2	41	29.1	61	43.3
B. 26- 50 %	11	7.8	10	7.1	21	14.9
C. 51- 75 %	11	7.8	00	0.0	11	7.8
D. 76-100 %	<u>41</u>	<u>29.1</u>	<u>07</u>	<u>5.0</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>34.0</u>
Total	<u>83</u>	<u>58.9</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>41.1</u>	<u>141</u>	<u>100.0</u>
18. Planning						
A. Total Respon- sibility	55	39.0	37	26.2	92	65.2
B. Sometimes Responsible	28	19.9	19	13.5	47	33.3
C. Never Resp.	<u>00</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>02</u>	<u>1.4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1.4</u>
Total	<u>83</u>	<u>58.9</u>	<u>58</u>	<u>41.1</u>	<u>141</u>	<u>100.0</u>

Questionnaire Item	Responses Based on the Type of Institution					
	Public		Private		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
19. Organizing						
A. Total Responsibility	48	34.0	32	22.7	80	56.7
B. Sometimes Responsible	35	24.8	21	14.9	56	39.7
C. Never Resp.	00	0.0	05	3.5	5	3.5
Total	83	38.9	58	41.1	141	100.0
20. Staffing						
A. Total Responsibility	41	29.1	24	17.0	65	46.1
B. Sometimes Responsible	38	27.0	23	16.3	61	43.3
C. Never Resp.	04	2.8	11	7.8	15	10.6
Total	83	58.9	58	41.1	141	100.0
21. Directing						
A. Total Responsibility	55	39.0	31	22.0	86	61.0
B. Sometimes Responsible	27	19.1	23	16.3	50	35.5
C. Never Resp.	01	0.7	04	2.8	5	3.5
Total	83	58.9	58	41.1	141	100.0
22. Coordinating						
A. Total Responsibility	51	36.4	37	26.4	88	62.9
B. Sometimes Responsible	29	20.7	19	13.6	48	34.3
C. Never Resp.	02	1.4	02	1.4	4	2.9
Total	82	58.6	58	41.1	140	100.0
23. Reporting/Dean						
A. Total Responsibility	35	24.8	36	25.5	71	50.4
B. Sometimes Responsible	35	24.8	17	12.1	52	36.9
C. Never Resp.	13	9.2	05	3.5	18	12.8
Total	83	58.9	58	41.1	141	100.0
24. Reporting/Ch'person						
A. Total Responsibility	44	31.7	32	23.0	76	54.7
B. Sometimes Responsible	29	20.9	14	10.0	43	30.9
C. Never Resp.	09	6.5	11	7.9	20	14.4
Total	83	58.9	58	41.1	141	100.0

Questionnaire Item	Responses Based on the Type of Institution					
	Public		Private		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
25. Budgeting						
A. Total Responsibility	38	27.0	34	24.1	72	51.1
B. Sometimes Responsible	31	22.0	15	10.6	46	32.6
C. Never Resp.	14	9.9	09	6.4	23	16.3
Total	83	58.9	58	44.1	141	100.0
26. _____						
27. _____						
28. _____						
29. _____						

APPENDIX E
SUMMARY OF ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSES TO
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS BASED ON THE
ENROLLMENT SIZE OF THE
INSTITUTION

Questionnaire Item	Responses Based on Enrollment Size of Institution													
	4,999 and Below	5,000-9,999	10,000-14,999	15,000-19,999	20,000-24,999	25,000 and Above	Total							
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%				
1. Gender														
A. Female	59	41.8	29	20.6	13	9.2	10	7.1	18	12.8	12	8.5	144	100.0
2. Age Range														
A. 21-30 yrs.	16	11.3	8	5.7	6	4.3	4	2.8	5	3.5	4	2.8	43	30.5
B. 31-40 yrs.	10	7.1	7	5.0	4	2.8	2	1.4	6	4.3	4	2.8	33	23.4
C. 41-50 yrs.	22	15.6	7	5.0	2	1.4	2	1.4	2	1.4	1	0.7	36	25.5
D. 51-60 yrs.	10	7.1	6	4.3	1	0.7	1	0.7	4	2.8	3	2.1	25	17.7
E. 61 & above	01	0.7	1	0.7	0	0.0	1	0.7	1	0.7	0	0.0	4	2.8
Total	59	41.8	29	20.6	13	9.2	10	7.1	18	12.8	12	8.5	141	100.0
3. Race														
A. Am. Indian	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7
B. Black Amer.	2	1.4	2	1.4	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	3.5
C. Oriental Am.	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7
D. Spanish Am.	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7
E. White/Cauc.	55	39.0	27	19.0	12	8.5	9	6.4	18	12.8	12	8.5	133	94.3
Total	59	41.8	29	20.6	13	9.2	10	7.1	18	12.8	12	8.5	141	100.0
4. Highest Degree														
A. Bachelor	5	3.6	4	2.9	1	0.7	0	0.0	1	0.7	0	0.0	11	7.9
B. Master	41	29.3	11	7.9	9	6.4	7	5.0	13	9.3	12	8.6	93	66.4
C. Specialist	4	2.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7	0	0.0	5	3.6
D. Doctoral	9	6.4	13	9.3	3	2.2	3	2.1	3	2.1	0	0.0	31	22.1
Total	59	42.1	28	20.0	13	9.3	10	7.1	18	12.9	12	8.3	140	100.0

Responses Based on Enrollment Size of Institution														
Questionnaire Item	4,999 and Below		5,000-9,999		10,000-14,999		15,000-19,999		20,000-24,999		25,000 and Above		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
5. Experience														
A. 0-5 yrs.	13	9.2	7	5.0	5	3.5	4	2.8	7	5.0	4	2.9	40	28.4
B. 6-10 yrs.	6	4.3	2	1.4	3	2.1	1	0.7	1	0.7	1	0.7	14	9.9
C. 11-15 yrs.	6	4.3	3	2.1	3	2.1	0	0.0	2	1.4	1	0.7	15	10.6
D. 16-20 yrs.	7	5.0	5	3.5	0	0.0	2	1.4	1	0.7	3	2.1	18	12.8
E. 21-41 yrs.	27	19.1	12	8.5	2	1.4	3	2.1	8	5.0	3	2.1	54	38.3
Total	59	41.8	29	20.6	13	9.3	10	7.1	18	12.8	12	8.5	141	100.0
6. Position Held														
A. P.E. Ch'per.	22	15.6	11	7.8	1	0.7	2	1.4	2	1.4	0	0.0	38	27.0
B. Ath. Dir.	13	9.2	4	2.8	1	0.7	2	1.4	1	0.7	1	0.7	21	14.9
C. Assoc. A.D.	3	2.1	1	0.7	1	0.7	1	0.7	1	0.7	0	0.0	7	5.0
D. Asst. A.D.	0	0.0	2	1.4	2	1.4	0	0.0	3	2.1	4	2.8	11	7.8
E. Intm. Dir.	18	12.8	7	5.0	2	1.4	0	0.0	4	2.8	3	2.1	34	24.1
F. Assoc. Im. Dr.	1	0.7	2	1.4	1	0.7	0	0.0	1	0.7	1	0.7	7	5.0
G. Asst. Im. Dr.	2	1.4	2	1.4	5	3.5	5	3.5	6	4.3	3	2.1	23	16.3
Total	59	41.8	29	20.6	13	9.3	10	7.1	18	12.8	12	8.5	141	100.0
7. Tenure														
A. Yes	35	24.8	15	10.6	2	1.4	3	2.1	6	4.3	2	1.4	63	44.7
B. No	24	17.0	14	9.9	11	7.8	7	5.0	12	8.5	10	7.1	78	55.3
Total	59	41.8	29	20.6	13	9.2	10	7.1	18	12.8	12	8.5	141	100.0
8. Teaching Time														
A. 0-25 %	16	11.3	16	11.3	12	8.5	6	4.3	14	9.9	11	7.8	75	53.2
B. 26-50 %	14	9.9	7	5.0	1	0.7	3	2.1	2	1.4	2	1.4	27	19.1
C. 51-75 %	13	9.2	3	2.1	0	0.0	1	0.7	1	0.7	1	0.7	19	13.5
D. 76-100 %	16	11.3	3	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7	1	0.7	20	14.2
Total	59	41.8	29	20.6	13	9.2	10	7.1	18	12.8	12	8.5	141	100.0

Responses Based on Enrollment Size of Institution														
Questionnaire Item	4,999 and Below		5,000-9,999		10,000-14,999		15,000-19,999		20,000-24,999		25,000 and Above		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
9. Release Time														
A. 0-25 %	46	32.6	18	12.8	10	7.1	6	4.3	16	11.3	12	8.5	108	76.6
B. 26-50 %	11	7.8	3	2.1	0	0.0	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	15	10.6
C. 51-75 %	2	1.4	6	4.3	2	1.4	2	1.4	2	0.0	0	0.0	12	8.5
D. 76-100 %	0	0.0	2	1.4	1	0.7	1	0.7	2	1.4	0	0.0	6	4.3
Total	59	41.8	29	20.6	13	9.2	10	7.1	18	12.8	12	8.5	141	100.0
10. Acq. Position														
A. Promotion	32	22.7	17	12.1	3	2.1	5	3.5	10	7.1	2	1.4	69	48.9
B. Application	27	19.1	12	8.5	10	7.1	5	3.5	8	5.7	10	7.1	72	51.1
Total	59	41.8	29	20.6	13	9.2	10	7.1	18	12.8	12	8.5	141	100.0
11. Rank														
A. Staff	7	5.0	5	3.5	1	0.7	2	1.4	2	1.4	4	2.8	21	14.9
B. Instructor	6	4.3	3	2.1	1	0.7	1	0.7	2	1.4	0	0.0	13	9.2
C. Asst. Prof.	20	14.2	3	2.1	0	0.0	1	0.7	4	2.8	0	0.0	28	19.9
D. Assoc. Prof.	18	12.8	5	3.5	1	0.7	1	0.7	1	0.7	1	0.7	27	19.1
E. Professor	5	3.5	8	5.7	2	1.4	2	1.4	2	1.4	1	0.7	20	14.2
F. Admin'tor	3	2.1	5	3.5	8	5.7	3	2.1	7	5.0	6	4.3	32	22.7
Total	59	41.8	29	20.6	13	9.2	10	7.1	18	12.8	12	8.5	141	100.0
12. Staff Size														
A. 0-5	30	21.3	5	3.5	8	5.7	4	2.8	5	3.5	1	0.7	53	37.6
B. 6-10	20	14.2	9	6.4	1	0.7	1	0.7	8	5.7	6	4.3	45	31.9
C. 11-15	6	4.3	4	2.8	1	0.7	1	0.7	2	1.4	1	0.7	15	10.6
D. 16-20	3	2.1	3	2.1	0	0.0	1	0.7	2	1.4	0	0.0	9	6.4
E. 21-72	0	0.0	8	5.7	3	2.1	3	2.1	1	0.7	4	2.8	19	13.5
Total	59	41.8	29	20.6	13	9.2	10	7.1	18	12.8	12	8.6	141	100.0

		Responses Based on Enrollment Size of Institution													
		4,999 and Below		5,000-9,999		10,000-14,999		15,000-19,999		20,000-24,999		25,000 and Above		Total	
Questionnaire Item		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
13.	Type of Institution														
	A. Public	10	7.1	21	14.9	13	9.2	10	7.1	18	12.8	11	7.8	83	58.9
	B. Private	49	24.8	8	5.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7	58	41.1
	Total.	59	41.8	29	20.6	13	9.2	10	7.1	18	12.8	12	8.5	141	100.0
14.	Enrollment														
15.	Type Program														
	A. Men	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	B. Women	26	18.4	8	5.7	5	3.5	2	1.4	4	2.8	1	0.7	46	32.6
	C. Co-ed.	33	23.4	21	14.9	8	5.7	8	5.7	14	9.9	11	7.8	95	67.4
	Total	59	41.8	29	20.6	13	9.2	10	7.1	18	12.8	12	8.5	141	100.0
16.	Salary Range														
	A. \$ 9,999-below	2	1.4	3	2.2	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	4.3
	B. 10,000-14,999	12	8.6	3	2.2	4	2.9	3	2.2	2	1.4	2	1.4	26	18.7
	C. 15,000-19,999	31	22.3	4	2.9	3	2.2	1	0.7	8	5.8	2	1.4	49	35.3
	D. 20,000-24,999	8	5.8	6	4.3	3	2.2	1	0.7	3	2.2	3	2.2	24	17.3
	E. 25,000-29,999	5	3.6	6	4.3	1	0.7	4	2.9	1	0.7	1	0.7	18	12.9
	F. 30,000-34,999	1	0.7	5	3.6	0	0.0	1	0.7	3	2.0	2	1.4	12	8.5
	G. 35,000-39,999	0	0.0	2	1.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7	3	2.2
	H. 40,000-above	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7	1	0.7
	Total	59	41.8	29	20.6	13	9.2	10	7.1	18	12.8	12	8.5	139	100.0

Responses Based on Enrollment Size of Institution														
Questionnaire Item	4,999 and Below		5,000-9,999		10,000-14,999		15,000-19,999		20,000-24,999		25,000- and Above		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
17. Adminis. Time														
A. 0-25 %	42	29.8	12	8.5	1	0.7	1	0.7	3	2.1	2	1.4	61	43.3
B. 26-50 %	12	8.5	4	2.8	2	1.4	1	0.7	2	1.4	0	0.0	21	14.9
C. 51-75 %	1	0.7	5	3.5	2	1.4	2	1.4	1	0.7	0	0.0	11	7.8
D. 76-100 %	4	2.8	8	5.7	8	5.7	6	4.3	12	8.5	10	7.1	48	34.0
Total	59	41.8	29	20.6	13	9.2	10	7.1	18	12.8	12	8.5	141	100.0
18. Planning														
A. Tot. Resp.	39	27.7	22	15.6	8	5.7	4	2.8	12	8.5	7	5.0	92	65.2
B. S'tms. Res.	18	12.8	7	5.0	5	3.5	6	4.3	6	4.3	5	3.5	47	33.3
C. Never Resp.	2	1.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	1.4
Total	59	44.8	29	20.6	13	9.2	10	7.1	18	12.8	12	8.5	141	100.0
19. Organizing														
A. Tot. Resp.	34	24.1	17	12.1	8	5.7	5	3.5	10	7.1	6	4.3	80	56.7
B. S'tms. Res.	21	14.9	11	7.8	5	3.5	5	3.5	8	5.7	6	4.3	56	39.7
C. Never Resp.	4	2.8	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	3.5
Total	59	41.8	29	20.6	13	9.2	10	7.1	18	12.8	12	8.6	141	100.0
20. Staffing														
A. Tot. Resp.	22	15.6	16	11.3	4	2.8	4	2.8	12	8.5	7	5.0	65	46.1
B. S'tms. Res.	25	17.7	11	7.8	8	5.7	6	4.3	6	4.3	5	3.5	61	43.3
C. Never Resp.	12	8.5	2	1.4	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	15	10.6
Total	59	41.8	29	20.6	13	9.2	10	7.1	18	12.8	12	8.5	141	100.0

Responses Based on Enrollment Size of Institution														
Questionnaire Item	4,999 and Below		5,000-9,999		10,000-14,999		15,000-19,999		20,000-24,999		25,000- and Above		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
21. Directing														
A. Tot. Resp.	31	22.0	22	15.6	6	4.3	5	3.5	14	9.9	8	5.7	86	61.0
B. S'tms. Res.	23	16.3	7	5.0	7	5.0	5	3.5	4	2.8	4	2.8	50	35.5
C. Never Resp.	5	3.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	3.5
Total	59	41.8	29	20.6	13	9.2	10	7.1	18	12.8	12	8.5	141	100.0
22. Coordinating														
A. Tot. Resp.	36	25.7	21	15.0	5	3.6	5	3.6	13	9.3	8	5.7	88	62.9
B. S'tms. Res.	20	14.3	8	5.7	7	5.0	5	3.6	5	3.6	3	2.1	48	34.3
C. Never Resp.	3	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7	4	2.9
Total	59	42.1	29	20.7	12	8.6	10	7.1	18	12.9	12	8.6	140	100.0
23. Reporting/Dean														
A. Tot. Resp.	37	26.2	10	11.3	4	2.8	3	2.1	8	5.7	3	2.2	71	50.4
B. S'tms. Res.	17	12.1	10	7.1	4	2.8	6	4.3	7	5.0	8	5.7	52	36.9
C. Never Resp.	5	3.5	3	2.1	5	3.5	1	0.7	3	2.1	1	0.7	18	12.8
Total	59	41.8	29	20.6	13	9.2	10	7.1	18	12.8	12	8.5	141	100.0
24. Rept'g./Ch'psn.														
A. Tot. Resp.	32	23.0	16	11.5	8	5.8	4	2.9	9	6.5	7	5.0	76	54.7
B. S'tms. Res.	13	9.4	11	7.9	4	2.9	4	2.9	7	5.0	4	2.9	43	30.9
C. Never Resp.	13	9.4	2	1.4	0	0.0	2	1.4	2	1.4	1	0.7	20	14.4
Total	58	41.7	29	20.9	12	8.6	10	7.2	18	12.9	12	8.6	139	100.0

Questionnaire Item	Responses Based on Enrollment Size of Institution													
	4,999 and Below		5,000-9,999		10,000-14,999		15,000-19,999		20,000-24,999		25,000- and Above		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
25. Budgeting														
A. Tot. Resp.	35	24.8	13	9.2	4	2.8	5	3.5	8	5.7	7	5.0	72	51.1
B. S'tms. Res.	17	12.1	10	7.1	8	5.7	2	1.4	6	4.3	3	2.1	46	32.6
C. Never Resp.	7	5.0	6	4.3	1	0.7	3	2.1	4	2.8	2	1.4	23	16.3
Total	59	41.8	29	20.6	13	9.2	10	7.1	18	12.8	12	8.5	141	100.0
26. _____														
27. _____														
28. _____														
29. _____														

APPENDIX F
SUMMARY OF ADMINISTRATORS' RESPONSES TO
QUESTIONNAIRE ITEMS BASED ON
THE POSITION HELD

Responses Based on the Administrative Position Held

Questionnaire Item	P.E. Chair-person		Athletic Dir.		Assoc. A.D.		Asst. A.D.		Intra-mural Dir.		Assoc. Im. Dir.		Asst. Im. Dir.		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Gender																
A. Female	38	27.0	21	14.9	7	5.0	11	7.8	34	24.1	7	5.0	23	16.3	141	100.0
2. Age Range																
A. 21-30 yrs.	3	2.1	7	5.0	0	0.0	2	1.4	11	7.8	3	2.1	17	12.1	43	30.5
B. 31-40 yrs.	4	2.8	5	3.5	3	2.1	5	3.5	9	6.4	2	1.4	5	3.5	33	23.4
C. 41-50 yrs.	14	9.9	6	4.3	3	2.1	2	1.4	10	7.1	1	0.7	0	0.0	36	25.5
D. 51-60 yrs.	14	9.9	3	2.1	1	0.7	1	0.7	4	2.8	1	0.7	1	0.7	25	17.7
E. 61 & Above	3	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	2.8
Total	38	27.0	21	14.9	7	5.0	11	7.8	34	24.1	7	5.0	23	16.3	141	100.0
3. Race																
A. Am. Indian	0	0.0	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7
B. Blk. Amer.	3	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	1.4	5	3.5
C. Oriental Am.	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7	1	0.7
D. Span. Amer.	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7
E. White/Cau.	35	24.8	20	14.2	6	4.3	11	7.8	34	24.1	7	5.0	20	14.2	133	94.3
Total	38	27.0	21	14.9	7	5.0	11	7.8	34	24.1	7	5.0	23	16.3	141	100.0
4. Highest Degree																
A. Bachelor	0	0.0	3	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	3.6	1	0.7	2	1.4	11	7.9
B. Master	18	12.9	12	8.6	5	3.6	10	7.1	23	16.4	5	3.6	20	14.3	93	66.4
C. Specialist	1	0.7	3	2.1	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	3.6
D. Doctoral	19	13.6	3	2.1	1	0.7	1	0.7	6	4.3	0	0.0	1	0.7	31	22.1
Total	38	27.1	21	15.0	7	5.0	11	7.9	34	24.3	6*	4.3	23	16.4	140*	100.0

*One missing

Responses Based on the Administrative Position Held

Questionnaire Item	P.E. Chairperson		Athletic Dir.		Assoc. A.D.		Asst. A.D.		Intramural Dir.		Assoc. Im. Dir.		Asst. Im. Dir.		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
5. Experience																
A. 0-5 yrs.	3	2.1	5	3.5	1	0.7	0	0.0	11	7.8	3	2.1	17	12.1	40	28.4
B. 6-10 yrs.	3	2.1	2	1.4	0	0.0	3	2.1	2	1.4	0	0.0	4	2.8	14	9.9
C. 11-15 yrs.	0	0.0	2	1.4	3	2.1	0	0.0	7	5.0	2	1.4	1	0.7	15	10.6
D. 16-20 yrs.	4	2.8	4	2.8	1	0.7	5	3.5	4	2.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	18	12.8
E. 21-41 yrs.	28	19.9	8	5.7	2	1.4	3	2.1	10	7.1	2	1.4	1	0.7	54	38.3
Total	38	27.0	21	14.9	7	5.0	11	7.8	34	24.1	7	5.0	23	16.3	141	100.0
6. Position Held																
7. Tenure																
A. Yes	31	22.0	9	6.4	4	2.8	3	2.1	14	9.9	1	0.7	1	0.7	63	44.7
B. No	7	5.0	12	8.5	3	2.1	8	5.7	20	14.2	6	4.3	22	15.6	78	55.3
Total	38	27.0	21	14.9	7	5.0	11	7.8	34	24.1	7	5.0	23	16.3	141	100.0
8. Teaching Time																
A. 0-25 %	6	4.3	8	5.7	5	3.5	11	7.8	19	13.5	5	3.5	21	14.9	75	53.2
B. 26-50 %	11	7.8	5	3.5	1	0.7	0	0.0	8	5.7	0	0.0	2	1.4	27	19.1
C. 51-75 %	11	7.8	3	2.1	1	0.7	0	0.0	3	2.1	1	0.7	0	0.0	19	13.5
D. 76-100 %	10	7.1	5	3.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	2.8	1	0.7	0	0.0	20	14.2
Total	38	27.0	21	14.9	7	5.0	11	7.8	34	24.1	7	5.0	23	16.3	141	100.0
9. Release Time																
A. 0-25 %	23	16.3	18	12.8	3	2.1	10	7.1	29	20.6	5	3.5	20	14.2	108	76.6
B. 26-50 %	7	5.0	2	1.4	1	0.7	0	0.0	2	1.4	1	0.7	2	1.4	15	10.6
C. 51-75 %	7	5.0	1	0.7	2	1.4	1	0.7	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	8.5
D. 76-100 %	1	0.7	0	0.0	1	0.7	0	0.0	2	1.4	1	0.7	1	0.7	6	4.3
Total	38	27.0	21	14.9	7	5.0	11	7.8	34	24.1	7	5.0	23	16.3	141	100.0

Responses Based on the Administrative Position Held

Questionnaire Item	P.E. Chair-person		Athletic Dir.		Assoc. A.D.		Asst. A.D.		Intra-mural Dir.		Assoc. Im. Dir.		Asst. Im. Dir.		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
10. Acq. Position																
A. Promotion	24	17.0	11	7.8	6	4.3	6	4.3	14	9.9	4	2.8	4	2.8	69	48.9
B. Application	14	9.9	10	7.1	1	0.7	5	3.5	20	14.2	3	2.1	19	13.5	72	51.1
Total	38	27.0	21	14.9	7	5.0	11	7.8	34	24.1	7	5.0	23	16.3	141	100.0
11. Rank																
A. Staff	1	0.7	3	2.1	0	0.0	1	0.7	8	5.7	2	1.4	6	4.3	21	14.9
B. Instructor	1	0.7	3	2.1	0	0.0	1	0.7	4	2.8	0	0.0	4	2.8	13	9.2
C. Asst. Prof.	8	5.7	8	5.7	1	0.7	0	0.0	9	6.4	1	0.7	1	0.7	28	19.9
D. Assoc. Prof.	12	8.5	5	3.5	3	2.1	0	0.0	5	3.5	2	1.4	0	0.0	27	19.1
E. Professor	16	11.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	1.4	2	1.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	20	14.2
F. Adm'tr.	0	0.0	2	1.4	3	2.1	7	5.0	6	4.3	2	1.4	12	8.5	32	22.7
Total	38	27.0	21	14.9	7	5.0	11	7.8	34	24.1	7	5.0	23	16.3	141	100.0
12. Staff Size																
A. 0-5	11	7.8	10	7.1	2	1.4	2	1.4	13	9.2	3	2.1	12	8.5	53	37.6
B. 6-10	12	8.5	6	4.3	1	0.7	1	0.7	14	9.9	3	2.1	8	5.7	45	31.9
C. 11-15	3	2.1	4	2.8	0	0.0	2	1.4	4	2.8	0	0.0	2	1.4	15	10.6
D. 16-20	6	4.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	1.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7	9	6.4
E. 21-72	6	4.3	1	0.7	4	2.8	4	2.8	3	2.1	1	0.7	0	0.0	19	13.5
Total	38	27.0	21	14.9	7	5.0	11	7.8	34	24.1	7	5.0	23	16.3	141	100.0
13. Type Institu.																
A. Public	17	12.1	8	5.7	4	2.8	11	7.8	17	12.1	4	2.8	22	15.6	83	58.9
B. Private	21	14.9	13	9.2	3	2.1	0	0.0	17	12.1	3	2.1	1	0.7	58	41.1
Total	38	27.0	21	14.9	7	5.0	11	7.8	34	24.1	7	5.0	23	16.3	141	100.0

Responses Based on the Administrative Position Held																
Questionnaire Item	P.E. Chairperson		Athletic Dir.		Assoc. A.D.		Asst. A.D.		Intra-mural Dir.		Assoc. Im. Dir.		Asst. Im. Dir.		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
14. Enrollment																
A. 4,999/Below	22	15.6	13	9.2	3	2.1	0	0.0	18	12.8	1	0.7	2	1.4	59	41.8
B. 5,000-9,999	11	7.8	4	2.8	1	0.7	2	1.4	7	5.0	2	1.4	2	1.4	29	20.6
C. 10,000-14,999	1	0.7	1	0.7	1	0.7	2	1.4	2	1.4	1	0.7	5	3.5	13	9.2
D. 15,000-19,999	2	1.4	2	1.4	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	3.5	10	7.1
E. 20,000-24,999	2	1.4	1	0.7	1	0.7	3	2.1	4	2.8	1	0.7	6	4.3	18	12.8
F. 25,000/Above	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	2.8	3	2.1	2	1.4	3	2.1	12	8.5
Total	38	27.0	21	14.9	7	5.0	11	7.8	34	24.1	7	5.0	23	16.3	141	100.0
15. Type Program																
A. Men	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
B. Women	8	5.7	20	14.2	2	1.4	4	2.8	11	7.8	0	0.0	1	0.7	46	32.6
C. Co-ed.	30	21.3	1	0.7	5	3.5	7	5.0	23	16.3	7	5.0	22	15.6	95	67.4
Total	38	27.0	21	14.9	7	5.0	11	7.8	34	24.1	7	5.0	23	16.3	141	100.0
16. Salary Range																
A. \$9,999/Below	0	0.0	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	3.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	4.3
B. 10,000-14,999	1	0.7	4	2.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	5.0	2	1.4	12	8.6	26	18.7
C. 15,000-19,999	14	0.0	8	5.8	1	0.7	1	0.7	15	10.8	3	2.2	7	5.0	49	35.3
D. 20,000-24,999	8	5.8	2	1.4	3	2.2	2	1.4	4	2.9	2	1.4	3	2.2	24	17.3
E. 25,000-29,999	5	3.6	6	4.3	2	1.4	3	2.2	1	0.7	0	0.0	1	0.7	18	12.9
F. 30,000-34,999	7	5.0	0	0.0	1	0.7	3	3.3	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	12	8.6
G. 35,000-39,999	2	1.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	2.2
H. 40,000/Above	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7
Total	37	26.6	21	15.1	7	5.0	10	7.2	34	24.5	7	5.0	23	16.5	139	100.0

Responses Based on the Administrative Position Held																
Questionnaire Item	P.E. Chairperson		Athletic Dir.		Assoc. A.D.		Asst. A.D.		Intramural Dir.		Assoc. Im. Dir.		Asst. Im. Dir.		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
17. Admin. Time																
A. 0-25 %	26	18.4	12	8.5	2	1.4	2	1.4	15	10.6	3	2.1	1	0.7	61	48.3
B. 26-50 %	5	3.5	4	2.8	0	0.0	3	2.1	6	4.3	0	0.0	3	2.1	21	14.9
C. 51-75 %	5	3.5	2	1.4	2	1.4	0	0.0	1	0.7	0	0.0	1	0.7	11	7.8
D. 76-100 %	2	1.4	3	2.1	3	2.1	6	4.3	12	8.5	4	2.8	18	12.8	48	34.0
Total	38	27.0	21	14.9	7	5.0	11	7.8	34	24.1	7	5.0	23	16.3	141	100.0
18. Planning																
A. Tot. Resp.	24	17.0	12	8.5	2	1.4	8	5.7	26	18.4	6	4.3	14	9.9	92	65.2
B. S'tms. Resp.	14	9.9	7	5.0	5	3.5	3	2.1	8	5.7	1	0.7	9	6.4	47	33.3
C. Never Resp.	0	0.0	2	1.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	1.4
Total	38	27.0	21	14.9	7	5.0	11	7.8	34	24.1	7	5.0	23	16.3	141	100.0
19. Organizing																
A. Tot. Resp.	21	14.9	10	7.1	3	2.1	6	4.3	23	16.3	5	3.5	12	8.5	80	56.7
B. S'tms. Resp.	15	10.6	9	6.4	4	2.8	5	3.5	10	7.1	2	1.4	11	7.8	56	39.7
C. Never Resp.	2	1.4	2	1.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	3.5
Total	38	27.0	21	14.9	7	5.0	11	7.8	34	24.1	7	5.0	23	16.3	141	100.0
20. Staffing																
A. Tot. Resp.	15	10.6	5	3.5	2	1.4	6	4.3	24	17.0	3	2.1	10	7.1	65	46.1
B. S'tms. Resp.	20	14.2	9	6.4	5	3.5	5	3.5	7	5.0	3	2.1	12	8.5	61	43.3
C. Never Resp.	3	2.1	7	5.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	2.1	1	0.7	1	0.7	15	10.6
Total	38	27.0	21	14.9	7	5.0	11	7.8	34	24.1	7	5.0	23	16.3	141	100.0

Responses Based on the Administrative Position Held

Questionnaire Item	P.E. Chair-person		Athletic Dir.		Assoc. A.D.		Asst. A.D.		Intra-mural Dir.		Assoc. Im. Dir.		Asst. Im. Dir.		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
21. Directing																
A. Tot. Resp.	24	17.0	9	6.4	2	1.4	6	4.3	27	19.1	5	3.5	13	9.2	86	61.0
B. S'tms. Resp.	13	9.2	9	6.4	5	3.5	5	3.5	6	4.3	2	1.4	10	7.1	50	35.5
C. Never Resp.	1	0.7	3	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	3.5
Total	38	27.0	21	14.9	7	5.0	11	7.8	34	24.1	7	5.0	23	16.3	141	100.0
22. Coordinating																
A. Tot. Resp.	25	17.9	12	8.6	2	1.4	8	5.7	27	19.3	3	2.1	11	7.9	88	62.9
B. S'tms. Resp.	12	8.6	7	5.0	5	3.6	3	2.1	6	4.3	4	2.9	11	7.9	48	34.3
C. Never Resp.	0	0.0	2	1.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7	0	0.0	1	0.7	4	2.9
Total	37	26.4	21	15.0	7	5.0	11	7.9	34	24.3	7	5.0	23	16.4	140	100.0
23. Rept'g./Dean																
A. Tot. Resp.	28	19.9	9	6.4	2	1.4	4	2.8	19	13.5	3	2.1	6	4.3	71	50.4
B. S'tms. Resp.	9	6.4	9	6.4	4	2.8	6	4.3	9	6.4	3	2.1	12	8.5	52	36.9
C. Never Resp.	1	0.7	3	2.1	1	0.7	1	0.7	6	4.3	1	0.7	5	3.5	18	12.8
Total	38	27.0	21	14.9	7	5.0	11	7.8	34	24.1	7	5.0	23	16.3	141	100.0
24. Rept'g./Ch'psn.																
A. Tot. Resp.	17	12.2	10	7.2	4	2.9	6	4.3	20	14.4	6	4.3	13	9.4	76	54.7
B. S'tms. Resp.	9	6.5	5	3.5	3	2.2	4	2.9	11	7.9	1	0.7	10	7.2	43	30.9
C. Never Resp.	10	7.2	6	4.3	0	0.0	1	0.7	3	2.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	20	14.4
Total	36	25.9	21	15.1	7	5.0	11	7.9	34	24.5	7	5.0	23	16.5	139	100.0

Responses Based on the Administrative Position Held

Questionnaire Item	P.E. Chairperson		Athletic Dir.		Assoc. A.D.		Asst. A.D.		Intramural Dir.		Assoc. Im. Dir.		Asst. Im. Dir.		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
25. Budgeting																
A. Tot. Resp.	24	17.0	12	8.5	3	2.1	5	3.5	17	12.1	1	0.7	10	7.1	72	51.1
B. S'tms. Resp.	10	7.1	8	5.7	3	2.1	5	3.5	7	5.0	3	2.1	10	7.1	46	32.6
C. Never Resp.	4	2.8	1	0.7	1	0.7	1	0.7	10	7.1	3	2.1	3	2.1	23	16.3
Total	38	27.0	21	14.9	7	5.0	11	7.8	34	24.1	7	5.0	23	16.3	141	100.0
26. _____																
27. _____																
28. _____																
29. _____																

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Almquist, E., & Angrist, S. (1971). Role model influences on college women's career aspirations. In A. Theodore (Ed.), The professional woman. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman.
- Arter, M. H. (1972). The role of women in administration in state universities and land-grant colleges. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University.
- Benton, S. Y. (1980, Summer). Women administrators for the 1980's: A new breed. Journal of the National Association for Women, Deans, Administrators and Counselors, 43, 6.
- Berwald, H. D. (1963, May). Attitudes toward women college teachers in institutions of higher education accredited by the North Central Association. Dissertation Abstracts, 23, 4161-4162.
- Bloom, L. Z., Pearlman, J., & Coburn, C. (1975). The new assertive woman. New York: Delacorte Press.
- Bowen, R. T. (1967, November/December). A man looks at girl's sports. Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 38, 43.

- Bucher, C. A. (1979). Administration of physical education and athletic programs. St. Louis: C. V. Mosby.
- Bucher, C. A., & Dupee, R. K., Jr. (1965). Athletics in schools and colleges. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education.
- Chancellor, W. E. (1915). Our schools, their administration and supervision. Boston: D. C. Heath.
- Deckard, B. S. (1979). The women's movement political, socioeconomic, and psychological issues (2nd ed.). New York: Harper & Row.
- Dubrin, A. J. (1972). Women in transition. Springfield, IL: Thomas.
- Englehart, M. D. (1972). Methods of educational research. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Epstein, C. F. (1973). Woman's place options and limits in professional careers. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Friedan, B. (1963). The feminine mystique. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Gardner, H. R. (1966). Women administrators in higher education in Illinois: A study of current career patterns. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University.
- Gadelmann, P. L. (1977). Equality in sport for women. Washington: American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation.

- Halpin, A. W. (1957). A paradigm for research on administrative behavior. In R. F. Campbell & R. T. Gregg (Eds.), Administrative behavior in education. New York: Harper & Row.
- Hunt, D. M. (1976). A study of administrative duties and their importance by those who administer intercollegiate athletic programs for women in Tennessee. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Middle Tennessee State University.
- Kaufman, H. (1961). The status of women in administration in selected institutions of higher education in the United States. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, New York University.
- McCarthy, M. M., & Webb, L. D. (1977, April). Women school administrators: A status report. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 61, 51, 54, 55, 56.
- National Council of Administrative Women in Education. (1952). Administrative women in higher education. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association.
- National Council of Administrative Women in Education. (1973). Wanted: More women in educational leadership. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- President's Commission on Higher Education. (1947). Higher education for American democracy. New York: Harper & Brothers.

- Reif, W. E., Newstorm, J. W., & Monczka, R. M. (1975, Summer). Exploding some myths about women managers. California Management Review, 17(15), 72-79.
- Resick, M. C., Seidel, B. L., & Mason, J. G. (1970). Modern administrative practices in physical education and athletics. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Scott, P. B. (1979, Winter). Moving up the institutional hierarchy: Some suggestions for young minority and women professionals for the notebook of a novice. Journal of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, 42, 34.
- Silver, P. F. (1977, November). Are women underqualified for leadership? Phi Delta Kappan, 59, 207.
- Simpson, L. A. (1968). A study of employing agents' attitudes toward academic women in higher education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University.
- Sisley, B. (1975a, October). Challenges facing the woman athletic director. The Physical Educator, 32, 122.
- Sisley, B. (1975b, June). A new breed: The woman athletic director. Journal of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, 46, 47.
- Smith, J. (1978, May). Encouraging women to enter administration. NASSP, 62, 114.

- Socolow, D. J. (1978, May). How administrators get their jobs. Change, 43.
- Staines, G., Tarris, C., & Jayaratne, T. E. (1974, January). The queen bee syndrome. Psychology Today, 55-60.
- Stencel, S. (1977a). International women's year, editorial research reports on the women's movement achievements and effects. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly.
- Stencel, S. (1977b). Reverse discrimination, editorial research reports on the women's movement achievement and effects. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly.
- Stencel, S. (1979). Women in the workforce, editorial research reports on the changing American family. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly.
- Worldbook Encyclopedia. (1979). Women, 21, 319.