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ABSTRACT

There are very few men that choose to enter the profession of teaching, especially at the elementary level (U.S. Bureau of Labor and Statistics, 2008). The men that do make this choice are faced with certain challenges and societal stereotypes that make this career path even more difficult to navigate. Given the small numbers that exist and some of the unique factors that face men at this level, the relationship between a male elementary classroom teacher and his building administrator is one to examine.

Within the context of the research that has been done on the gendered role of elementary classroom teachers, as well as the studies that have documented best practices in Educational Leadership, this study will investigate what impact, if any, the principal plays in the professional life of a male elementary classroom teacher.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A visitor walks into an elementary school, signs in on the visitor’s log, and asks to visit the first grade classroom. When shown to the classroom, the visitor is surprised to see a man in the front of the classroom, teaching. The visitor asks if this man is the substitute and when told “No,” asks if there were no other “real” first grade teachers available when hiring. When told that this is a “real” first grade teacher, the visitor looks surprised.

When it comes to teaching, males are the underrepresented gender in the classroom. Current research indicates that 25% of all teachers are men, while a mere 10% teach in the elementary grades (Center for Evaluation & Education Policy, 2008). The overall social sentiment seems to be that teaching is women’s work, and further, that teaching young children is not appropriate work for a man (DeCorse & Vogtle, 1997; Hansen & Mulholland, 2005; King, 1998; Vogt, 2002). These stereotypes are particularly interesting, given that there is such sensitivity to gender issues in 2010.

According to the National Education Association Research, the proportion of elementary school teachers who are male has dropped to the lowest level in almost thirty years (NEA, 2003). It has become so ingrained into the collective psyche that rarely is the question raised as to why this is the case (Hill, 1996). For the most part, women
teachers are supportive of male counterparts, yet some research indicates there is a small amount of “resentment” for the men who cross into women’s territory (Cohen, 1990).

Historically, women were the leading gender in the classroom because the perception was that they were a better fit as role models and teachers of moral behavior (Wiest, 2003). In addition, it was thought that women had the emotional qualities to deal with young people better than men. Further studies have found that the low status, low pay, and an association to “mothering” have deterred some men from choosing this very important work (Burgess & Carter, 1992; King, 1998).

From their research, Johnston and colleagues (1999) suggested that there are “gendered perceptions as to whether men are ‘better-qualified’ to teach at the primary or secondary level” (p. 56). In this study the participants reported that they internalized the stereotypical view of primary teaching as a female realm. The data from the study indicated that males believed that men made “better secondary teachers” (Johnston, McKeown, & McEwen, 1999, p. 57).

This is corroborated by the work of Carrington (2002). In this study, both males and females reported concerns about their place in a primary classroom. A female partner told one male in the study that he “wouldn’t cope” with the “caring role” he needed to be successful (p. 295). In the study, some females mentioned that men are “brought up” believing that teaching is women’s work because “people still see it as a woman’s job” (p. 296).

Still many men reported that there are intrinsic values to teaching at the primary level (Carrington, 2002, Wiest, 2003). Their choice to enter the profession was
motivated by their love for children and the desire to make a difference in the lives of children. Some men in the research believed this can happen more readily with younger children than with older children (Galley, 2000). Even those men who choose to enter the profession from another career find personal satisfaction in the work, regardless of the financial difference in the salaries for the most part (DeCorse & Vogtle, 1997).

King’s work (1998) explored the concept of care and the delicate balance that men are faced with as a result. For him, teaching and caring at the primary level are inextricably connected. “Primary grade teaching and caring behavior are nearly synonymous in our culture. Teachers of young children are automatically assumed to care about and provide care for their students” (p. 65). If that were the case, it would be acceptable for men to demonstrate this “care” with and among their students. However, King points out that “the behaviors that are seen as care…are associated with women. Men’s performance of these behaviors involves crossing the gender borders” (p. 83).

Sadly, research from Francis and Skelton (2001) brings to light the suspicion that can surround a man who chooses to work with young children. The pedophilia panic does indeed deter men from teaching at the primary level. There is plenty of research to substantiate this claim, as men identify this suspicion as a reason for opting not to teach at the elementary level (Carrington, 2002; DeCorse & Vogtle, 1997; Francis & Skelton, 2001; King, 1998). King points out, “A public perception is that men who teach primary grades are often either homosexuals, pedophiles, or principals in training” (p. 3). Given that men are faced with considerably more challenges before stepping foot in the elementary classroom, especially in 2010, why would one choose this profession?
Men are simply scarce in elementary classrooms. There are elementary schools that have no male faculty members (Sargent, 2002) and many of the men who are in elementary buildings report that they are the “token male” (Allan, 1997). Statistics from the National Education Association indicate that not only are the men not in elementary classrooms, secondary male teachers are at the lowest level in forty years, dropping to thirty-five percent (NEA, 2003). From the “feminization of teaching” to pedophilia, from lack of male role models to an ethic of care crisis, there are many reasons in the research that address this trend.

Recently, Gilbert and Williams’ (2008) research indicated that women were considered “more suitable to nurture young children.” Their work also explored the realities of “touch” that take place in the elementary classrooms, and the results were overwhelmingly “delineated by gender.” Sadly, this is echoed by “Peter” a first grade teacher in a paper presented by Gary Jones (2001). The following is an excerpt from this piece:

A young lady named Mandy in Peter’s class wet her pants. With her head down, crying, she spoke only to her teacher. Peter left the room with Mandy, and the researcher (Jones) took over the class, following up with Peter later in the day. He recalls how difficult this situation was for Peter, who began by asking the secretary for help and then the nurse. Peter was careful to help Mandy, but not too much. He waited outside of the nurse’s office, in view of the principal and the secretary. (pp. 5-6)
Jones made a point of emphasizing that Peter was in plain view of other adults, while Mandy was changing her clothes.

Peter struggled with this; knowing that he could not “abandon her in the busy office during the lunch hour;” and also could not give even the hint of impropriety during this time of need (Jones, 2001). As Peter waited on the other side of the door for Mandy, he felt the weight and significance of the door; “it was the door between the child and the man” (Jones, 2001). Peter explained further in a taped interview:

There’s a line here, I don’t know exactly what it is, but there’s a line. We talk about issues for males in elementary. Yes, there are issues for men in elementary, but they are not good teaching issues, they are care giving role issues (Peter, taped conversation, February 4, 2000 in Jones, 2001).

Both Vogt (2002) and Hansen and Mulholland (2005) explored exactly “how” male teachers care in their role at the elementary level. Vogt’s work indicated that even though caring is seen as an integral part of teaching at the elementary level, it is still gendered. Her conclusions assert that if caring is to be considered professional, it cannot be associated “exclusively motherly or parental.” Without this, she argues the caring male teacher will be viewed as less than the committed teacher that he is.

Hansen and Mulholland (2005) explored how male and female teachers are “permitted” to relate to and care for their elementary students. Even if caring is viewed as an expression of one’s humanity, “men are viewed as sexualized in predatory ways in our culture” (King, 1998). King goes on further to say that men are “allowed to hug children at home…outside of home…[t]hey hug women.” If men are only “allowed” to
hug children at home, what is a male elementary teacher to do when a hug is what a first grader needs while crying during a sad moment? Clearly this is a dilemma that men face in the classroom.

Whether through showing affection, tough love, or community building, the men in Hansen and Mulholland’s (2005) study experienced what males find in elementary classrooms: there are many sexual stereotypes and fears to overcome as a male within a caring profession. The tensions and contradictory messages that men face make teaching at the elementary level particularly difficult. Even though some of the men in the study acknowledged they did not consider teaching to be a caring profession at first, the participants changed their mind once their formal education was completed (Hansen & Mulholland, 2005).

Cushman (2008) as well as Marsh, Martin, and Cheng (2008) explored the concept of role models and academic achievement, in relation to male teachers. Marsh, Martin, and Cheng found that pedagogy, not gender, was the significant factor that impacts students in the classroom. In this study, girls were better motivated than boys, regardless of whether the teachers were male or female. The researchers went so far as to say that “there was little or no evidence to support the benefit of male teachers for boys.”

Cushman’s (2008) work supported the research of Marsh et al. (2008). In this study of principals, the majority wanted more “role models” in their schools. However, their reasons were not linked to academic performance. Instead, many noted the absence of man in the homes and the societal concerns surrounding the lack of positive male role models for many children, especially boys.
Others have noted that men enter this profession, given some of the difficulties outlined above. Carrington (2002), Skelton (2003), and Cushman (2005) found that both males and females alike indicated that working with children was the primary factor in deciding to be a teacher. However, in Carrington’s (2002) research, both women and men reported that there were gendered perceptions as to what was an appropriate teaching level for men. Specifically, the data indicated that men made “better secondary teachers.” Interesting to note from this research was that elementary teaching does not provide men and women the same chance for promotion to administration. Nearly a third of both men and women in the study (31% and 32% respectively) responded that there are more men in leadership positions. One woman reported, “Not many male primary school teachers are seen – they all seem to be either department heads or heads [of school], not just normal teachers” (Carrington, 2002).

Skelton’s (2003) work also confirmed that there is an intrinsic value in teaching for both men and women. Yet the overwhelming sentiment was that teaching was “women’s work.” Even so, men who taught students on the upper end of the primary spectrum struggled more with the images of masculinity than those who were on the lower end of the spectrum.

Cushman (2005) echoed the work of her colleagues when studying the choice of elementary teaching as a career. Unique to this research was the fact that males are more likely to have chosen teaching after other careers. Also Cushman’s research found that low status was a consistent theme from family and friends, when told that a man was teaching at the elementary level.
Whether struggling with low status, how to demonstrate care appropriately, academic achievement or Mandy’s wet underpants, few men teach at the primary level. When they do, there are hurdles they must clear under the microscope of being a man in a woman’s world. Despite the obstacles, desiring to make a difference and trusting the intrinsic value in the work, men still do choose to teach at the elementary level 180 days each year.

**Research Question**

Despite the challenges that men in elementary classrooms face, many choose to teach at this level and do so quite well. The focus of this study was the administrators who work with these men on a daily basis. It appears as if there is a gap in the research, as this topic has not been explored thoroughly. The primary research question is *what is the role that a principal has in the professional lives of male elementary classroom teachers?*

Specifically the fundamental research questions are:

1) What are administrators’ perceptions of the various stereotypes that men face as classroom teachers at the elementary level?

2) Given the challenges that men face who choose to teach at the elementary level, what does an administrator need to do to help these men maintain success and be effective in the classroom?

There are considerations and implications for principals who have male teachers in elementary classrooms. Much of the research has focused on recruiting strategies (Carrington, 2002; Skelton, 2001; Wiest, 2003). This writer contends that retaining
males in elementary classrooms is just as critical as getting them there in the first place. Exploring this sub-question is vital not only to educational research but to societal stereotypes. Since the research indicates that males who choose this career path are faced with certain challenges and hurdles that their female counterparts are immune from, leadership and supervision must reflect this distinction. For principals, supervising teachers individually is arguably as important as a teacher providing differentiated instruction in a classroom full of diverse learners. The role a school leader plays for a male teaching in an elementary classroom could prove to be a new area for educational research to investigate. At the very least, it is something to consider when asking questions about retaining males that choose to teach in elementary classrooms.

**Preliminary Research Design**

The researcher employed a qualitative research design and used a qualitative questionnaire to gather data and qualitative methodologies to analyze the experiences of administrators who supervise men at the elementary level. The goal was to understand the experiences of the administrator.

The researcher was interested in the experiences of a range of administrators. Living in a rural area, the researcher sent out a qualitative questionnaire to all building administrators inclusive of PK – K, PK – 1, PK – 2, PK – 3, PK – 4, PK – 5 in Cook County Illinois, excluding the City of Chicago.
Limitations

While this study sought to gather rich data on the experiences of administrators with males teaching in elementary classrooms, there were limitations.

This was a qualitative study of 187 administrators who may or may not have males teaching in elementary classrooms. A larger sampling would offer larger implications for the education field. This limitation could impact the data.

Another limitation was that while the researcher sent out 187 questionnaires, there were some who choose to not take part. This too could limit the data findings of this research study.

A third limitation was that those who took part in the questionnaire may not recall accurately past events, or may give misleading answers to questions, resulting in less than precise data to analyze.

Another limitation was that the experiences of the administrators with males teaching in elementary classrooms may be colored by their own biases about men in elementary classrooms. It may be surmised that all the men in the study are choosing to be in the classroom and are not there for any external, financial, or other restricting factors.

Another limitation was that the researcher was a first grade teacher for one year in a public charter school and was an administrator at a K – 8 Catholic elementary school. It is to be noted that while the researcher was an administrator, there were no male teachers in regular classrooms. The only males in the building were a part of the Facilities and Maintenance staff. Having been in the classroom, certainly there are experiences of
which the researcher has recollection. However, the researcher will keep a journal acknowledging biases in an attempt to keep them out of the research.

Despite these limitations, it must be understood that while male elementary school teachers are small in number, their impact on the lives of the students they teach is just as important as their female counterparts. What this researcher learned as a result of this study can offer building administrators with male elementary school teachers an opportunity to better serve the men who teach. Further, what this researcher learned can offer solace to male elementary school teachers who see their numbers dwindling. For these reasons, this particular study is relevant, constructive, and worthwhile.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In order for any researcher to properly orient oneself to the topic, significant investigation into the existing research is undertaken. For this researcher, the relationship between male elementary classroom teachers and their building administrators represents a gap in the current educational literature. It has been well documented that males represent a small fraction of the teachers in elementary classrooms (menteach.org; NEA, 2003; U.S. Bureau of Labor and Statistics, 2008).

The issue of the relationship between a building administrator and the male elementary teachers seems noteworthy, given attempts at not only racial but gender balance within today’s elementary classrooms as well. If the profession at this level continues to be dominated by women, the question of whether there will be gender balance is raised. At the very least, a balance of gender in elementary education may create more of a balanced education for children (Skelton, Carrington, Francis, Hutchings, Read, & Hall, 2009).

To better focus the scope of this study, the relationship between a male elementary classroom teacher and his building administrator, literature was reviewed according to the following themes relevant to the question of this study:

1) Career Choice in Education

2) The Need for Male Role Models
3) The Ethic of Care in Education

4) The Role of the Principal

5) Leadership

Through a review of the literature, the researcher will demonstrate that there is a
gap in educational research and therefore the topic is a worthy one to investigate.

**Career Choice in Education**

According to DeCorse and Vogtle (1997), “[m]en moving into traditionally female
jobs are perceived as stepping down in status,” (p. 38) so why would a male enter such an
(p. 246). He continues:

> the conflict occurs when men experience pressure from social norms and
> peers to behave in a traditional masculine manner that dictates a stoic
> disposition and the pursuit of power, control, and wealth, while they desire
> to expand their emotionally expressive nature. (p. 246)

It would seem that even men who do enter this field do so at their own risk and would
struggle to navigate the conflict that Galbraith argues. If men do not succumb to role
conflict, then they may suffer from Foster and Newman’s (2005) “identity bruising.”
Their argument is that the low status afforded to male teachers, and the fact that men
could be a danger to young children, result in derogatory comments from parents, friends,
partners, and/or colleagues.

Adrian, one of the men in Foster and Newman’s (2005) study shared with the
mother of a friend that he was planning on becoming a primary teacher. This woman was
herself a primary teacher. She told Adrian, “I am sure you can do something better than that” (p. 347). From that cryptic response, Adrian noted: “I remember her reaction. I was really quite surprised by it; it was suddenly a really negative statement for someone to come out with” (p. 347). While Adrian admitted feeling “bruised” by the statement he also told the researchers, “I like to think I’ve got a strong character and I don’t care what other people say” (p. 347).

Despite such negativity, the main reason that males (and females) give for entering the elementary classrooms is an interest in working with children out of a love for children and a desire to impact their lives (Carrington, 2002; Cushman, 2005; DeCorse & Vogtle, 1997; Wiest et al., 2003). Jack, a male in Carrington’s (2002) research responded, “Love children. Hope it will be rewarding in making a difference in real lives. It seems a secure job” (p. 293). An unnamed participant in Cushman’s (2005) research reported, “It was my first choice. It was about loving playing and loving school in itself and feeling I might be able to make a difference” (p. 328). Another unnamed member of DeCorse and Vogtle’s (1997) study noted, “It’s such a rush to see the light go on for kids. Once you see the spark in their eyes, it’s how do I ignite that further?” (p. 39).

Some of the other research about primary teaching as a career demonstrates subtle shifts and nuances relating to gender. Male elementary teachers often enter teaching from other occupations and are therefore older than men entering other careers (Cushman, 2005; DeCorse & Vogtle, 1997; Wiest et al., 2003). In Cushman’s (2005)
study, it was noted that changes in the first career caused the men to think about teaching again. As one participant reported:

Although I initially thought of it when I left school, I ended up going and training as a technician, and worked there for 16 years. The last four years of that I started to turn back towards education, and I ended up as a training instructor. That sort of gave me the taste again, but then when I downsized, I ended up having to look and say, ‘O.K., exactly what do I do from here?’ (p. 329)

Wiest and colleagues (2003) identified from their work that female elementary education majors are three times more likely than their male counterparts to identify their own elementary education as when they were inclined to teach at that level. Men who entered as a first career began to think about this in high school or college (Wiest, Olive, & Obenchain, 2003). Further, DeCorse and Vogtle (1997) found that men did not choose teaching initially for economic and social reasons; it was neither “legitimate [n]or lucrative in the long run” (p. 40). A participant in this research study noted:

My parents always thought I should try something like international business. Being a school teacher doesn’t rank up there. I know they want me to be happy, so they’d never say anything but the topic of ‘my son, the elementary school teacher’ probably isn’t discussed the way it would be if it were ‘my son, the international banker’. (p. 40)

It is noteworthy that in Carrington’s (2002) study, in DeCorse and Vogtle’s (1997) research, and Cushman’s (2005) work that salary and status play a role in the
career choice of the men in the study. While ultimately many of the men did choose to teach at the elementary level, the topic of money came up. More than two-thirds of the respondents in Carrington’s (2002) research indicated that there was concern about pay levels at the primary level. Historically, Cushman (2005) cites salary and status as reasons that men choose not to teach in elementary schools.

DeCorse and Vogtle (1997) take a different approach to the issue of salary. In their research, they determined that men made a conscious decision to teach at the elementary level, despite the lower pay, especially men that were choosing teaching as a second (or third) career. They note that participants in their study “may have developed a more mature outlook on the prospect of their life’s work,” and thus knowingly enter into this profession with a lower salary choosing instead a better quality of life (p. 41). Several of the participants noted this:

I’m in a corporation. I’m doing well but I’ve had enough of it. I figure teaching will be much more rewarding than what I’m doing now.

I have a good job, I’m making enough money – more money than I’d make as a teacher, but money’s not a motivation. What’s motivating is getting across to young kids.

I want to teach because I feel I can make a difference in the children’s lives and it’s my calling. It’s what I’m supposed to do. I’m not going to get rich at it. (p. 41)

Finally, Carrington’s (2002) research, DeCorse and Vogtle’s (1997) study and Wiest and her colleagues (2003) explore the upward mobility of some men from the
classroom to the ranks of administration. Wiest and her colleagues found that 39% of the male elementary education majors aspire to move to administration. One of the participants in Carrington’s (2002) research reported that “Not many male primary school teachers are seen – they all seem to be either deputy heads or heads, not just normal teachers” (p. 296).

DeCorse and Vogtle (1997) go so far as to call this a phenomenon a “glass elevator” (p. 42). It seems as if men are given a preferential treatment when it comes to consideration for administrative positions. As one male from their study reports, it felt less preferential and more of an expectation.

I wish I had a dollar for every time someone asked me when or if I was going to be principal. Don’t they realize how prejudiced that is? To ask that question is to say my job isn’t as important or as real as an administrator’s. I resent it. (p. 42)

Further, a participant in Carrington’s (2002) research echoed this sentiment: “Not many male primary school teachers are seen – they all seem to be either deputy heads, or heads, not just normal teachers” (p. 296). Also in this same study, more than forty percent of the males reported that primary teaching does not provide men and women with the same opportunities for promotion, while more than one-third of the females in this study also noted the same inequality.
The Need for Male Role Models

Even though the career choice of elementary school teaching is fraught with extrinsic factors and pressures, men that make this choice do so for intrinsic reasons. Men choose to teach simply as a result of a love for children and a desire to make a difference their lives (Carrington, 2002; Cushman, 2005; DeCorse & Vogtle, 1997; Wiest et al., 2003). However, one reason that has consistently been associated with recruiting more men to teach at the elementary level is the need for young boys to have positive male role models in their lives (Cushman, 2008).

Allan (1994) found that almost all the men he interviewed for his study reported that there was a “public perception” that the need for male teachers was important because of the “increasing number of single parent families, or families in which fathers ha[d] limited or distant interactions with their children” (p. 5). For the men in this study, role modeling was an unwritten but essential expectation of their job as teachers. Further, it is work that “‘a’ single male or few can perform in an otherwise all-female faculty” (p. 7). It is a more important component to the male teachers’ responsibilities in the classroom than is role modeling for female teachers. The career choice is widely seen as work that women do and the “attributes and behaviors of primary teachers, and specifically their teaching roles [are] characteristically feminine” (King, 1998, p. 86).

One of the men in Allan’s (1994) study noted:

I don’t know. It’s just maybe that the town wants more male teachers. I think that everybody, there’s been so many females in elementary for so
long, and they’d like to have more males there. I don’t know if it’s because of the divorce rate and all that. (p. 5)

Still another pointed out:

Well, I think that one thing I’ve noticed is that there’s a lot more single parents, households, kids coming from single parents, from living with their mother, and I think that, you know, it’s not really our job to do it, but I think they look at it as being a male role model of...maybe disciplining them a little more than they get at home, maybe showing them that they can grow up to be someone fairly important. (p. 7)

Cushman’s (2008) study of New Zealand principals found that the majority of those surveyed would like more male role models in their schools; however, there was some significant ambiguity about what exactly constituted a role model. Is the male teacher as male role model to exhibit the qualities of a good “male” person or a good male teacher (Carrington & Skelton, 2003; Cushman, 2008)? Do students see their teachers as role models at all? Carrington and Skelton (2003) argue that more young people view a role model as someone who is an “inspirational figure” and that person is more likely to be from the popular media than a teacher.

The men themselves are equally confused as to what it means to be a male role model. Consider one of the men in Allan’s (1994) study who said, “I don’t know what it means to be a male role model as a teacher. I say I do it, but I don’t know what it means. I guess I say I do it because I have so many parents who say I do it” (p. 8). Still the principals from Cushman’s (2008) study were clear that
he must ‘look like a man’, ‘dress like a man’, ‘enjoy being a male’, ‘undertake “male” tasks’, ‘walk the talk of a male’, and ‘display the indefinable essence of maleness as opposed to femininity’. (p. 131)

From the principals’ perspectives, male teachers must exhibit certain traditional male behaviors to convince their colleagues that they are indeed real men.

Martino and Kehler (2006) take a different perspective on this issue regarding male teachers as role models. They point out that the discourse within the male role model debate draws attention to the powerful logic of recuperative masculinity politics. These politics are governed by the idea that men are disadvantaged [simply by their gender] through structural and institutional relations of inequality [in elementary education], thus paralleling the oppressive power relations impacting women’s participation in the labour market. (p. 122)

Further, they argue that accepting the assumption that men are associated with “inequitable power relations” obscures what their research bears out as the heart of male teachers’ fears: allegations of child abuse or pedophilia (p. 125). To that end, some men define their role in opposition to the women elementary teachers. They work to do “nothing feminine” and demonstrate a “hyper masculinity” (Allan, 1994; Martino & Kehler, 2006). By doing so, these men guard against any challenges to their masculinity to avoid any association with homosexuality. Consider Duane’s response to the following question in Allan’s (1994) research:
Q: Are there things that if a man is not a coach, but he wants to be a successful elementary teacher and get along, that he can do that give him the same kind of entry?

A: He had best not be the least bit feminine. I mean they expect a male teacher to be a man, whether he is a coach or not. If a man were perceived as feminine, I’m sure it would be a problem. You need to be a male role model. Be the opposite of being feminine. Now that’s pretty subjective. I guess I see it as a man who is willing to be involved in male related activities. That is not to say that involvement in female related activities is wrong…but sports, fishing, rather than cooking. I don’t think it’s wrong to do the cooking and things that are traditionally feminine, but yet the kids need foremost for you the male…the traditional male type things need to be more preeminent. (p. 10)

One male in Hasse’s (2008) research noted that, “I don’t do the mothering role that lots of female teachers do” (p. 597).

Other men see their role as being in concert with the “feminine” aspects of themselves and thus this leads others to perceive them as being feminine. Curt in Allan’s (1994) study had an interesting exchange:

Q: I want to return to your comment that elementary teachers are perceived as being feminine. You believe that there is such a public perception?

A: Oh there is.
Q: There’s no question in your mind about that.

A: Oh no. I mean it’s like saying George Bush is the President.

Q: What does that mean being more feminine?

A: When men do what women usually do, people think it’s a sissy activity.

Q: How does that perception affect you?

A: I think you just develop a thick-skinned attitude. (p. 11)

The vague nature of what it means to be a role model and the gendered perceptions of feminine and masculine cloud the “roles” that men are asked to fill in the elementary classrooms in which they teach.

For building administrators, there is more of a sense of what they are looking for in terms of a “male role model.” Cushman’s (2008) work demonstrates that more than half of the participants used gender-neutral terms to describe the personal qualities associated with a male role model:

Fair and compassionate, approachable, able to form good professional relationships, willingness to be involved and a great teacher. The same qualities I would like for all teachers. (p. 132)

The same qualities that more than half (53%) of the principals in this study would look for in all teachers, regardless of gender, they also categorize as those they would seek out in a male role model. From this research, principals know what they expect for male teachers when considering what it means to be a “male role model.” The male teachers struggle to find their way to a clear sense of what those words mean. A common
definition of “male role model” would clear away some of the uncertainty that surrounds an already ambiguous position as a male elementary classroom teacher.

To thoroughly understand what a male role model is, one must investigate this meaning looking through the lens of others. For African-Americans, the notion of role model is very clear. Bryant and Zimmerman (2003) define a role model as those people who “are key references…because they provide a window to the future, model positive behavior, and display adaptive techniques to which [one] can aspire to” (p. 37). In this study, the authors found that the males without male role models in their life, regardless of who that role model is, made poor choices in relation to substance use, delinquency, academic engagement, and psychological well-being (Bryant & Zimmerman, 2003). In Miller’s (2005) study of students of color already enrolled in teacher education programs, every participant in the study was able to identify at least one teacher as being a role model. One participant wrote, “When I was in second grade, I transferred schools and my teacher really devoted so much time just to me. That really meant so much” (p. 6). For those in this study, the role model not only impacted their life in a significant and meaningful way, it was inspirational for the participants to follow them into teaching.

Another underrepresented ethnicity in the literature is Hispanics. Franquiz and Salazar (2004) studied the impact of a “humanizing pedagogy” on Hispanic students and found that teachers who practice “humanizing pedagogy” are “instrumental in fostering healthy educational orientations” among their students (p. 36). Much of the related literature when reviewing through the Hispanic lens, centered around retention of Hispanic/Latino students and resiliency. Cunningham (2006) et al. found that mentoring
and support through the LUCERO (Latinos United with Energy Respect and Price) Program for students of Latino students caused an increase in retention to 80% for these students, compared to only fifty-six percent for the remaining student body.

Resiliency was also a theme in Franquiz and Salazar’s (2004) study and critical to this success was respect from the teacher to the students. In one school noted in the study, a white teacher provided instruction almost exclusively in English to a classroom of students who were of Hispanic/Chicano/Mexican heritage. Ms. White Chocolate (a name given to the teacher by the students) had earned the respect from her class because, “she understands the struggles of being brown in this school and in this town. She is white on the outside but brown on the inside” (p. 40). The students in this classroom had not experienced much academic success in a “regular high school curricula and schedule of classes” (p. 40). Yet, in Ms. White Chocolate’s classroom, the students were able to realize academic success. One student reported:

People get along here. Everybody talks to one another, so it’s not like being in other classes where some people are quiet and others do all the talking… In here it’s not like that. We’re all part of something. We’re a family. (p. 41)

The authors of this study found, that the positive relationships between students and teachers as well as the safe space established for dialogue were foundational to the success the students achieved. Further, such respect not only led to students achieving academically but also fostering a healthy construction of self in a classroom as an English Language Learner (Franquiz & Salazar, 2004).
The Ethic of Care in Education

To this point in the review of relevant literature, what is compelling is that even though men are faced with daunting consequences in terms of career choice and that at best, the concept of a male role model is vague, this does not deter men from entering this level of teaching. Granted, the men are almost nonexistent in these primary classrooms (King, 1998). However, consistently men like Jessie in Carrington’s (2002) study state, “I enjoy working with and helping children. Also the intrinsic rewards of seeing your own effort on children and how they get on in later life – giving them a good start” (p. 293). Furthermore, one of the participants in Cushman’s (2005) research reported, “I’d seen myself as someone who got on well with kids, and I love playing. I’m kind of a play person myself, and I knew teaching would give me so many things to get into” (p. 328). Even if men struggle to understand just what “role” they are to play in the lives of the children they teach, beyond that of teacher, and despite the reality that the public routinely questions why a male would enter this profession as a career choice, men teach in primary classrooms.

Teaching in primary classrooms “has been construed as an act of caring” (King, 1998, p. 3). For the purposes of this study, care is defined as:

The commitment to act in behalf of the cared-for, a continued interest in his reality throughout the appropriate time span, and the continual renewal over this span are the essential elements of caring. (Noddings, 1984, p. 16)

Unfortunately there is an ambivalent attitude toward men expressing care in physical ways and thus, men who choose to work in elementary classrooms are often monitored
more than their female counterparts (Hansen & Mulholland, 2005). This is noted in King’s (1998) research as Steve reported, “Society allows men to hug children at home. But outside of home, men don’t hug children or other men. They hug women” (p. 79).

Hansen and Mulholland (2005) identify care as an area “where the boundary between masculine and feminine is most clearly defined, and yet at which boundary, crossing is most necessary and most hazardous” (p. 121). King (1998) goes so far to say, “care is requisite for, or synonymous with, primary grade teaching” (p. 4). Given this, the notion of care must be explored further.

Nias (1989) describes teaching in the primary grades as an experience that requires teachers to not only care for but also love the children in their classrooms. Further, Nias points out that primary teachers teach both curriculum and relationships. King (1998) summarizes Nias’ assessment of primary teaching by arguing that primary teachers integrate subject areas such as math, science and literacy into cohesive, inclusive learning activities. Similarly, primary teachers interact with students, as well as with other teachers in ways that build and maintain close relationships with a sense of connectedness. So, integration occurs in primary teachers’ subject areas and their personal relationships. (p. 12)

Noddings (1984) goes further by arguing that the very act of teaching includes moral and ethical relationships that she interprets as caring. These acts are between the one caring (the teacher) and the one cared for (the students). She argues that the profession of teaching is one that is characterized by a “very special – and specialized –
caring relationship” (p. 174). “When a teacher asks a question in class and a student responds, the teacher receives not just the ‘response’ but the student [as well]” (p. 176).

King (1998) notes that as a result, the answer is less important than the interaction between the student and the teacher. For Noddings (1984), teachers are able to focus on students by “be[ing] totally and nonselectively present to the student – each student – as he addresses me” (p. 180). In 1999, Noddings clarified this further when she noted “it is not possible to care adequately for people without responding to their needs and interests” (p. 12). Thus, care is the context and framework for interactions between teachers and students, in the primary classrooms especially.

This notion of care is borne out further in Vogt’s (2002) research as she explored teachers’ own conceptions of caring within the classroom. Her participants noted that caring includes an interest in what is happening to their students both inside and outside the classroom. Arthur was a part of this research and he reported

A caring teacher – someone who shows interest in the children, not just the work, but what is happening in the playground, at home; sympathetic, again, the children would come and talk to you and approach you. (p. 258)

One of her participants taught the youngest age group in the primary school where this research was conducted. Philip noted that for him, caring is “fundamental” for teaching and learning:

Teachers are as much carers, as much as they need to be aware of learning.

I’d see colleagues who do not seem to care as much. The response they
get is different, they are not liked by the children or not loved or it is just
that they don’t have the relationship with the children. (p. 258)

Yet when it came to physical contact, the men in Vogt’s (2002) research echoed
King’s (1998) assertion that there are boundaries of acceptable contact. Interestingly
noted in Vogt’s research was that there were two determining factors: the gender of the
teacher and whether or not the teacher was a parent (him or herself). Note Arthur’s
delicate moment from Vogt’s study:

There is a stigma attached to male teachers with little children. And they
are very trusting and you have to be very careful. You will say change for
PE and they will strip down completely – ‘come on put your pants back
on’ – and these sort of things…and you could put yourself in a very
awkward situation and that is why I was happier when I was married and
when I had my own children. Because it’s perhaps more a father figure.
(p. 259)

The fear of abuse allegations also colors the landscape for men in primary
classrooms (Hansen & Mulholland, 2005; King, 1998; Vogt, 2002). This affects men as
they attempt to be caring teachers within a context where abuse allegations can mar a
teaching career. Note the lengths to which John in Vogt’s research shares his concern:

John: I don’t know, I feel uncomfortable in society today, I mean, I feel as
if parents frown at me. I mean, children in this school, they are very
loving, they come and give you a hug…
Vogt: How do you deal with it then?

John: It is just making sure you have other people around, never be alone with a child, which is, any teacher should never be alone with a child… I don’t know, it is just making sure that no one could have a doubt about your intentions towards the children… I am going into reception. I think is suggested, well, to every teacher is suggested to have a cushion to put on your knee, for any child in distress to sit them on a cushion on your knee rather than have them straight on your knee so that no allegation could come that way. (p. 260)

One man in King’s research indicated that physical contact was only one of the ways that he was careful in his classroom:

I cannot show the same affection as a woman can because it’s inappropriate behavior for a man. I know that. So, I don’t do that. It’s what other people think. I can lose my job. And all that would take is ‘He looked at me funny’. (p. 78)

The notion of being watched by other adults, notably parents of the children in a male-taught primary classroom was also noted by Van in King’s (1998) research:

I have to be rather insensitive to these kids. I don’t like to be but I could lose my job. Say I was spending extra time with a little girl who just lost her father, whether through divorce or death, I could actually help her through a tough time by being a father figure. But others might say ‘Why
is he spending so much time with that little girl?’ It puts me at a
disadvantage. (p. 79)

Since teaching, especially at the primary level, has been so closely associated with
caring, men must negotiate their way through this challenging environment. Vogt (2002)
argues that to avoid characterizing this integral aspect of primary teaching as feminine
and/or gender different, a caring teacher would be defined as one who is “committed to
teaching and to professional relationships with the pupils” (p. 262). She offers a
continuum of caring that “is highly linked with femininity at one end and with a less
gendered identity at the other,” the latter of which includes professional identity (p. 262).

Whether or not this gains any acceptance, such a definition of caring would be
helpful to the small number of men who teach in elementary classrooms. They walk a
fine line through an ambiguous understanding of what it means to be a role model; this
continuum would be a starting point for a discussion as to how men can care
appropriately and effectively for the students in their classroom. This would be a step
toward what Peter described as acceptance in Hansen and Mulholland’s (2005) study,
“It’s like I’m a teacher, and it wasn’t whether I was male or female” (p. 129).

**The Role of the Principal**

One of the most critical elements to this study is the role that the building
administrator plays in the professional life of the male elementary school teacher. For the
purposes of this study, it is critical to note the areas of concern that face a male teaching
in an elementary classroom. However, before the researcher can examine the relationship
a building administrator has with a male elementary school teacher, the role of a building
 administrator must be thoroughly reviewed. The principal’s role is pivotal in the supervision, evaluation, and professional development of all teachers and is a key component to the relationships with male teachers, and that is to be examined through this research.

While there are many aspects of a principal’s job description that may go unnoticed by a classroom teacher, there is one aspect that gets the attention of every classroom teacher: the evaluation. Conley and Glasman (2008) note that if a teacher is fearful of a summative evaluation, s/he may withhold information about their own shortcomings and/or goals. The same authors argue that due to the emphasis on political reform that is in schools, administrators may be reluctant to give teachers detailed feedback, as this has implications toward overall school accountability.

A participant in Wang and Day’s (2002) study pointed out that:

Being observed has always made me uncomfortable. Special discomfort I had was when I was observed by my principal. Not matter how prepared I was, I was always nervous. I did finish my tasks, but they didn’t go smoothly. (p. 7)

Another respondent from the same study noted:

…It is never a realistic look at the classroom because the students are aware that you are being observed and behave differently. …Once, I was giving a lesson on the overhead. The principal walked in to observe. The students were not themselves. Not only did I not once have to say to a student to pay attention, but no one participated. I felt that they were in a
total fear mode. It also made me feel like the teacher saying: ‘Anybody …anybody!’ (pp. 7-8)

In the case of this teacher, fear not only affected the teacher, but the students as well. The natural reaction to such fear is to bring out the dog-and-pony show for the observation. Again from Wang and Day’s (2002) work, one teacher in the study reported:

I remember being observed by the director of the ESL program at our school early in my career. She had largely developed the program in our district and was well-known in other districts for the workshops she held and the expertise she offered. While I looked up to her and felt comfortable in her warm presence, I was very nervous about being observed. I tried to incorporate many things I had learned from her in the lesson she would observe…as I taught a lesson about phrasal verbs, using a lamp as my prop. Of course, I had really made an effort to pay attention to the planning of the lesson in order to put my best foot forward and received a positive evaluation. (pp. 9-10)

There is nothing unusual about trying to demonstrate one’s best in the course of an observation. Yet, the reality is that not all lessons incorporate all aspects of a teacher’s pedagogy on a regular basis. In the same study, a teacher was asked if the lesson would have been taught differently if there was no observer in the room. The teacher reported:

…While I probably would have taught the lesson the same way if I had not been observed (because of the limited experience then), I’m sure that I
would have been more natural and less guarded and inhibited, and therefore, more effective. …The positive evaluation most likely came from my incorporation of the principles and beliefs of the director regarding ESL instruction in the lesson. (Wang & Day, 2002, p. 10)

However, fear need not drive, nor characterize the perceptions of the teachers in the process of evaluation. Zimmerman and Deckert-Pelton (2003) found in their study that 89% of participants saw “a bidirectional process of professional improvement with their principals [as] vitally important to their continued growth as educators” (p. 32). These teachers further indicated that for evaluations to be deemed effective, the conversations would include “constructive general feedback, encouragement, pedagogically appropriate feedback and adequate time for the feedback process” (p. 32).

Many of the teachers in this study (Zimmerman & Deckert-Pelton, 2003) reported that they value the pedagogical feedback they receive from their administrators during evaluation. However a distinction is drawn in the study when the respondents considered whether or not their principal is a knowledgeable educator and evaluator. One teacher reported that the evaluation is helpful because “I receive feedback from a more experienced individual/administrator that is beneficial for me” (p. 34). Another teacher supported this and added, “Many times administrators are more experienced than the teachers they evaluate and their insight can be very helpful to a teacher in her delivery of instruction” (p. 34).

However, if the perception of the teacher is that the administrator has little teaching or pedagogical experience, the teachers’ beliefs in the value of the evaluative
feedback is reduced. One teacher reported “The administrators who have evaluated me in the past have never had the same (or even close) subject matter background” (p. 34). From this study, it is evident that teachers see evaluator knowledge of teaching and experience teaching as an indicator of whether or not an administrator can/will be an effective evaluator.

Evaluation is not the only avenue when an administrator is in regular contact with classroom teachers. The first years of teaching are ripe with challenges for teachers from the mundane to the pedagogical and everything in between. Peter Youngs (2007) researched the relationship between principals and new teachers.

Youngs (2007) found that successful school leaders not only ensured that new teachers were paired with an appropriate mentor and met regularly, not only with the mentor, but grade-level colleagues as well. Further, these school leaders addressed curriculum, pedagogy, and assessment consistently in their regular interactions with the new teachers. One of the novice teachers reported, “As a new teacher, new to the grade and new in general, that’s a godsend [meeting with mentors and grade-level colleagues once a week] especially when you don’t have a feel for the curriculum” (p. 113).

One of the more successful principals in Youngs (2007) study observed each first and second year teacher in the building three times in the fall, per district policy. However, it was the emphasis on the link between instruction and student learning that she highlighted during the postobservation conferences. This principal noted:

Student achievement is a top priority. Kids have to be learning at the correct level of difficulty. By looking closely at student work, teachers
can see whether they’re meeting their objectives and what changes they
might need to make to engage certain students. (p. 114)

This came to fruition later as one of the second year teachers reported that:

[b]y looking at some of his [a student for who was struggling with word
problems, reading on a first-grade level in a second grade classroom]
work, Rachel [the principal] and I were able to come up with some
strategies for him. (Youngs, 2007, p. 114)

Youngs (2007) reported some relationships that were not nearly as effective as the
ones noted above. One principal in the study matched new teachers with mentors who
taught in different content areas and grade levels, and occasionally paired new teachers
with other new teachers as planning partners. When a second year fifth-grade teacher
was asked why she perceives she was paired with a first year teacher as a planning
partner, the teacher admitted, “I don’t understand why the administration would put two
beginning teachers together. That was one big downfall” (p. 124). The principal was
asked about his approach to matching new teachers to mentors and planning partners. He
reported, “I try to take care of that quickly in the fall. I ask the mentors if they have time
and then I match them with a newcomer. I might need to put a little more time into that”
(p. 124).

To make matters worse, this same principal did not establish trust with the new
teachers at the school. A first year teacher noted that when he sent a disciplinary incident
took place in his classroom, he did not feel support from the administration. The teacher
told Youngs (2007):
I sent three of [my students] to the office and all of them came back with nothing [no punishment]. They pretty much laughed in my face. I had assured them they would receive a 2-hour detention… What riled me up was the fact that he told me that they’re trying to keep statistics down, and that was why he sent them back. (p. 124)

Unfortunately, this teacher saw shortcomings in the principal’s leadership and applied for other positions in other districts.

For a principal to be effective, perception is reality. Whether it is fear (Conley & Glasman, 2008; Wang & Day, 2002), experience as an educator and evaluator (Zimmerman & Deckert-Pelton, 2003), or the guiding hand (or lack thereof) of a building administrator mentoring new teachers (Youngs, 2007), principals are judged by the way they are perceived. Kersten and Israel (2005) identify time, unions and school culture and evaluation process constraints as three impediments to highly effective teacher evaluation. However, the successful principals in the literature are able to overcome these by earning the trust of the teachers in their buildings, putting their beliefs into action on a day-to-day basis.

Given that men in early elementary education face challenges of their own in terms of perception, it is noteworthy that administrators also struggle with issues of perception from the teachers in their building. Despite this, administrators must consistently work toward establishing and maintaining the trust of those teachers in the building. If an administrator does not earn the trust of the teachers in his/her building, Sergiovanni and Starratt (2002) argue that teachers lose their sense of commitment.
Further, the researchers argue that this leads to alienation and feelings of resentment toward the administrator.

Since men in elementary education have found difficulties that women teaching at the same level do not face, it seems even more critical that trust is established between administrators and all teachers. Nevertheless, the question remains whether or not administrators are aware of the difficulties men face when choosing to teach in an elementary classroom. Regardless of the challenges that administrators face, it is incumbent upon them to foster a sense of trust in the development of all teachers, regardless of age, gender, and/or experience.

**Leadership**

In order to do justice to a dissertation in the School of Education, in the Department of Administration and Supervision, the researcher must thoroughly ground this chapter in the fundamentals of teacher supervision and evaluation. To do so is a daunting task, as leadership is frequently misunderstood; it is confused with authority and management, power and influence. There are certain subtleties of educational leadership that have implications for career choice, role models, and care for male teachers in elementary education. Essentially, the relationship between the male teacher and his building supervisor is the crux of this research. To explore it, one must be familiar with what educational leadership looks like.

There are many different definitions for what leadership is; yet one area of common ground that various authors share is that leadership is not a tangible thing (Bolman & Deal, 2003, Morgan, 1998, Sergiovanni, 1992). For the purposes of this
research and this chapter, leadership “exists only in relationships and in the imagination and perception of the engaged parties” (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 337). Given the scope of this research, it makes sense to use this as the working definition of leadership as the researcher aims to explore that relationship between the male elementary educator and the building supervisor.

Bolman and Deal (2003) go further when discussing what is good leadership. They argue that “all good leaders must have the right stuff – such qualities as vision, strength, and commitment that are essential to leadership – and that good leadership is situational; what works in one setting will not work in another” (p. 339). Thus, what one building principal does to earn a good leader label in one building, would not necessarily earn the same principal the same label in another building. While there are certain characteristics that some leaders share, leaders are expected to “persuade or inspire rather than to coerce or give orders” (p. 337).

As the researcher discovered when reviewing the related literature regarding males in elementary classrooms, there are gender issues when it comes to leadership. Morgan (1998) describes the influence of gender as he noted the differences:

Traditional forms of organization are often dominated and shaped by male value systems. For example, the emphasis on logical, linear modes of thought and action and the driver for results at the expense of network and community building, from a gender standpoint, express values and approaches to life that are much more ‘male’ than ‘female’. (p. 129) He contrasts this with his analysis of the female influence:
From a cultural standpoint, organizations shaped around female values are more likely to balance and integrate the rational-analytic mode with the values that emphasize more empathic, intuitive, organic forms of behavior. Interestingly, the new flat network forms of organization that are emerging to cope with the uncertainty and turbulence of modern environments require managerial competencies that have more in common with the female archetype than the male. (p. 129)

Bolman and Deal (2003) note a “female advantage” to leadership. They argue, “…women are more likely to bring [characteristics] such as concern for people, nurturance, and willingness to share information” (p. 346). They further submit that it would be expected that women would be described as warm, supportive and participative and would not be known for being powerful, shrewd, and aggressive (p. 346).

It is an interesting contrast to note in the literature that the care necessary to teach in a primary classroom (King, 1998; Nias, 1989) are the same qualities that are eschewed in a leadership position. Modeling care in the elementary classroom is an area of concern for men, while modeling care in a leadership position is an area of concern for women. While this is a subtlety worthy of note, further discussion is beyond the scope of this study.

For Sergiovanni (1992), leadership in and of itself is too ambiguous and thus he distinguishes the different aspects of leadership and how they must work in concert for one to be an effective school leader. The “hand” of leadership refers to the behaviors that a leader exhibits, the ways that one responds to a given set of circumstances, on a given
day, in a given school building, during a given time period. However, there is a significant caveat to this discussion of the “hand.” “[T]he hand alone is not powerful enough to account for what leadership is; indeed, it may not represent leadership at all” (p. 7).

The next aspect of leadership is the “heart.” “The heart of leadership has to do with what a person believes, values, dreams about, and is committed to…” (Sergiovanni, 1992, p. 7). For Sergiovanni, this encompasses who this leader is at his/her core. The “heart” grounds the leader in his/her own reality.

The final aspect of Sergiovanni’s (1992) leadership is the “head.” This facet of moral leadership involves the practical application of the theories that educational leaders are taught, combined with reflection. “Reflection, combined with personal vision and an internal system of values, becomes the basis of leadership strategies and actions” (p. 7).

The three pieces of Sergiovanni’s leadership argument work together to ensure the success of the others; they are each dependent on the others to demonstrate the utmost in leadership. Note Sergiovanni’s argument to sum up this descriptive section: “The head of leadership is shaped by the heart and drives the hand; in turn, reflections on decisions and actions affirm or reshape the heart and the head” (p. 7).

Sergiovanni and Starratt (2002) argue even further that there is a moral dimension of teaching that is to be encouraged by supervisors. “Professional virtue” is what separates professionals from simply being competent. This is what allows professionals to earn the trust of those they are working with. A professional is an expert, demonstrating such a wide array of technical knowledge that befits autonomy, but not
necessarily worthy of the label of professionalism. To earn that characteristic for Sergiovanni and Starratt, one must model the four dimensions of professional virtue:

- A commitment to practice in an exemplary way
- A commitment to practice toward valued social ends
- A commitment not only to one’s own practice but to the practice itself
- A commitment to the ethic of caring. (p. 58)

Each of these areas is worthy of a brief discussion.

A commitment to practice in an exemplary way means that a teacher is current with the latest research in the field, staying on the cutting edge of teaching, sharing and reflecting with others and taking risks in the classroom. This leads to teachers taking responsibility for their own professional development, from planning to implementation. This kind of commitment reduces the need for teachers to “showboat” during formative and summative evaluations, and gives the supervisors the freedom to view supervision and evaluation as something other than a “bureaucratic requirement” (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002, p. 165).

A commitment to practice toward valued social ends calls for teachers to place themselves at the service of the students, parents, and major stakeholders in the school community. Further, it places emphasis on the teachers’ promise to strive toward the agreed-upon school values, purposes, and mission. The school as a community of learners brings together others in the physical community it is a part of “to perpetuate and renew the life of the larger civic community by exploring ways to carry the culture and
the policy forward to the next generation” (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002, p. 275). A teacher with this commitment serves this community.

A commitment not only to one’s own practice but to the practice itself pushes teachers to see teaching as a collective practice, beyond one’s individual classroom. Given this, it would not be permitted for one teacher to be successful, while others were failing (regardless of the definition of success and failure). If one has unique insights into pedagogy, they would be shared willingly and received by others as such. “It would not be acceptable for one teacher to teach competently in the company of others having difficulty, without being concerned, without offering help” (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002, p. 59).

A commitment to the ethic of caring has been discussed thoroughly earlier in this chapter. However, for Sergiovanni and Starratt (2002), this is woven intricately into the commitment to the practice of teaching itself. Not only students, but teachers as well, model kindness and respect to allow all to grow as learners. Learning is a life-long process, and teachers participate by not only learning from colleagues but from the students themselves. A high priority is placed on listening to and learning from the exchange of values and ideas in a school community where these commitments are present.

For these researchers, “the action of supervision takes place within an existing moral environment created by the professionalism of teachers,” who model professional virtue through their commitments (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002, p. 58). Clearly, as all teachers are different, each brings different strengths and weaknesses to the profession.
No one-size-fits-all approach can work in the context of such differences. However, if there is a “range of options” they could be considered as “branches that come from a common stem” (p. 244).

Charlotte Danielson’s (1996) framework for professional practice represents all aspects of a teacher’s responsibilities that are reflected in their daily work. Specifically, the framework is comprehensive, public, and generic. It is comprehensive in that it refers not only to what occurs in the classroom but outside of those four walls as well. The framework is publicly known, and thus if it is used for supervision, it eliminates the fear of the “gotcha” mentality. It is generic so that it can be applied to every teaching situation, because every teaching situation is unique, from grade level to grade level, from classroom to classroom and from day to day. Each day in every classroom around the world a different set of interactions take place between the same teacher and students, that is not repeated anywhere else, rarely is it even repeated in that same classroom.

This framework groups teachers’ responsibilities into twenty two components, which are further grouped into four areas: planning and preparation (Domain 1), classroom environment (Domain 2), instruction (Domain 3), and professional responsibilities (Domain 4). Each component defines “a distinct aspect of a domain; two to five elements describe a specific feature of a component” (Danielson, 1996, p. 1). The components apply to all settings and allow teachers to demonstrate proficiency in different ways. Such a framework is not unique to education, there are other professions that use frameworks to guide both novice and advanced practitioners. This is the
guarantee that “the members of a profession hold themselves and their colleagues to the highest standard” (p. 2).

The framework is not a checklist of specific behaviors, nor is it an endorsement of a particular teaching style. However, it is dependent on context and can be demonstrated in diverse ways. The components of the framework demonstrate “that even though good teachers may accomplish many of the same things, they do not achieve them in the same way” (Danielson, 1996, p. 17). Teachers need to have an arsenal of various strategies to use in a given situation, for a given purpose, within the instructional goals. There is no one approach that will be effective in every situation. Given that, a supervisor must take care not to “impose their own style on what they see” (p. 20). The supervisor must apply the framework, based on the context of the classroom and the teacher’s approach during the lesson. Key components to this framework are the self-evaluation rubrics, encouraging a rich dialogue between the teacher and the administrator when it is time to review the evaluation.

There are several underlying assumptions that the framework is based on. It is grounded in research, it offers a new paradigm for learning and teaching, and it focuses on the purposeful nature of teaching, in a community of learners. The framework also recognizes the role of appropriateness in making decisions and argues for the professional nature of teaching (Danielson, 1996).

Whether theoretical or empirical research and given the difficult nature of education research, this framework is grounded in a body of research that identified “principles of effective practice and classroom organization…[that] maximize student
learning and promote student engagement” (Danielson, 1996, p. 21). Still, it offers a paradigm of learning and teaching that will carry further into the 21st century. While basic knowledge is important for students to understand, it is the processes of acquisition of deep conceptual understanding and processing of information that is central to this new paradigm. Thus, all instructional decisions are critical and purposeful. This means that the teacher is no longer the “sole source of knowledge” in the classroom (p. 26). The teacher does not choose activities and assignments because they are fun. They are chosen because they bring the teacher closer to meeting the instructional goals, as guided by the students’ interests and strengths (Danielson, 1996). The classroom is a community where everyone’s insights and contributions are valued and respected.

Danielson’s (1996) framework is rooted in the fact that certain behaviors in the classroom do not always ensure success. Instead, what is “appropriate” given the situation, the instructional goals, and the students in a specific classroom is what drives the conversation. Such conversations cause colleagues, teachers, and/or supervisors to discuss the rationale for professional judgments. Finally, the framework asserts the professional nature of teaching. It does not rely on professional virtue (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002) but points to the complexity of the new paradigm of teaching and learning. Decisions within that paradigm depend on a “sophisticated understanding of the content to be learned and the nature of learning itself” (Danielson, 1996, p. 27).

It seems that Danielson’s (1996) framework would lead to the sense of trust that is considered vital after discussion in the section “The Role of the Principal.” Teachers that trust their administrators “engage…at a level of moral discourse that mirrors the moral
responsibility teachers model for their students” (Sergiovanni & Starratt, 2002, p. 69).
Such a moral responsibility would include the external factors that men struggle with when choosing to teach in an elementary classroom.

Summary

The literature discussed in this chapter is evidence of not only the complex world of a male elementary teacher, but the complicated world that leadership, evaluation, and supervision play in the life of an administrator. All relevant theorists and their theories demonstrate that even under the best circumstances, the relationship between a male elementary school teacher and his direct supervisor will be one that requires significant effort to maintain the trust necessary for both parties to grow professionally. Additionally, when one takes into account the other factors that impact a male choosing to teach at the elementary level, there is a good chance that this relationship can become much more challenging for both the teacher and the administrator.

Nevertheless, knowledge of these complicating factors and the relevant literature regarding educational leadership will enable the researcher to find answers to the following questions:

1) What are administrators’ perceptions of the various stereotypes that men face as classroom teachers at the elementary level?

2) Given the challenges that men face who choose to teach at the elementary level, what does an administrator need to do to help these men maintain success and be effective in the classroom?
CHAPTER III
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The reality that there are very few men in elementary education cannot be disputed. The recent data from the 2008 Bureau of Labor and Statistics population survey reported that fewer than 3% of preschool and kindergarten teachers and just 19% of elementary and middle school teachers are men (Bureau of Labor & Statistics, 2008).

The reasons that men choose to enter this profession, given such low numbers are personal. The relationship with their building administrator remains an area that has not been investigated fully. Even with numbers as low as 3% in early elementary and 19% in elementary and middle schools, there are men in classrooms. The supervision of these men by their building supervisors is a rich, yet personal area for this researcher to explore. To that end, this researcher intends to shed light on this area that has not been completely investigated.

Research Strategy

Given the highly personal nature of the relationship between building administrator and male teacher, a qualitative approach was selected. Qualitative research seeks to better understand a social circumstance, from the perspective of those involved. This research seeks to “understand and interpret how the various participants in a social setting construct the world around them” (Glesne, 2006, p. 4). To do so, there must be access to the perspectives of the participants. Therefore, investigating the experiences of
building administrators who are charged with, among other duties, supervising elementary school teachers, is a qualitative study.

Further, a qualitative questionnaire design was selected to explore the research questions. This methodology was selected in order to gain access to the perspectives of a large number of building administrators anonymously. In collecting qualitative data, this researcher “[sought] to capture the richness of people’s experience in their own terms” (Patton, 1987, p. 10). Primarily, a large number of viewpoints were important to determine if there were similarities in the experiences of building administrators supervising elementary school teachers. Also, to ensure answers that were as honest as possible, the anonymous format was selected.

The researcher chose not to use an ethnographic approach. Ethnographic means to describe a people or a cultural group (Glesne, 2006). This qualitative methodology would not work in this case as there are not enough male elementary school teachers to study and document in one group setting; therefore, the number of building administrators would also be small. In addition, the researcher was trying to reach a large number of administrators to ascertain if there are any similarities in their supervisory experiences.

The researcher chose not to use a case study approach. The research purpose of a case study is to describe “one or more cases in-depth” (Johnson & Christensen, 2004, p. 363). While it would be possible to identify a small number of cases of a building administrator supervising a male elementary school teacher, the researcher was hoping to reach a large number of administrators to identify what their supervision and experience
yields when working with male elementary school teachers. It is possible that follow-up research to explore this topic further could be pursued using the detailed account of a small number of administrators, but that is not the aim of this research.

The researcher chose not to implement a grounded theory approach. If following this model, the researcher attempts to “inductively generate a grounded theory describing and explaining a phenomenon” (Johnson & Christensen, 2004, p. 363). The aim of this research is not to develop a theory but to explore this relationship between an administrator and the male elementary school teacher(s) that are (have been) supervised. There will be some conclusions drawn at the end of this study, and in no way are the conclusions to be thought of as theories. There were too many limitations to this study for the researcher to state a theory as a result of this work.

The researcher chose not to pursue a historical research model for this study. While the history of male elementary school teachers certainly factored into the discussion, it was not the focus of the study. The focus of this research was not to better understand the events of the past but to further learn from the experience of administrator who currently (or recently) supervised male elementary school teachers. Perhaps a historical study would be considered as an avenue for further research in the future.

The researcher chose not to use the quantitative methodology for this study. “Qualitative research is often exploratory; that is, it is often used when little is known about a certain topic or when an inductive approach is deemed more appropriate to learn about a topic” (Johnson & Christensen, 2004, p. 30). The researcher did not intend to test a hypothesis in the course of this study. Instead, the researcher hoped to examine
behavior that was self-reported by building administrators who may have had the experience of supervising male elementary school teachers. There were no factors that the researcher will control or manipulate. Instead, the researcher hoped that the anonymous qualitative questionnaire would elicit rich responses from administrators who could shed some light on this relationship that does not often exist in elementary schools.

Site Selection

The original sample group was selected using the following criteria:

1. The building must contain a kindergarten, but can also contain a pre-kindergarten;
2. The building must not contain grades six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven, or twelve; and
3. The building must be located in Cook County, Illinois, exclusive of the City of Chicago.

The rationale for the building containing a kindergarten but also possibly containing a pre-kindergarten was that there are some schools that begin with kindergarten and some that begin with pre-kindergarten. The researcher does not want to eliminate any potential administrator that may have a male teaching in one of those grades. The researcher was focusing the research on building administrators at the elementary level and therefore did not wish to include those administrators who supervise grades six through twelve. The reason for this is that the number of men as classroom teachers grew, as the distance from the early elementary years grows as well (Bureau of Labor & Statistics, 2008).
Cook County, Illinois, exclusive of the City of Chicago was selected because of the high diversity of socio-economic status in the City of Chicago, leading to a large disparity in school funding. The City of Chicago was excluded so as not to skew the data.

The study investigated the public elementary schools. The data indicates that the lowest numbers of men are in the early elementary grades and the numbers increase as the grade level increases (MenTeach.org, 2009). The researcher was interested in the experience of building administrators where men are rarely teaching.

The researcher selected public schools. The researcher is currently an administrator in a Catholic school and has had the majority of his experience in Catholic schools.

The pool of schools as identified totaled 187. The researcher mailed 187 questionnaires. If approximately 25% of the schools responded, the questionnaires would total approximately 47. Seventy-nine questionnaires were returned, thus 79 was the actual sample size for this research.

**Sampling Plan**

The questionnaire was sent to every elementary school principal in Cook County, Illinois, exclusive of the City of Chicago, that satisfies the criteria listed above. For the purposes of this study, an elementary school was defined as a school containing a kindergarten or pre-kindergarten but not containing grades six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven or twelve. The “n” for receiving questionnaires is 187. Hopeful of at least a 25% response, the researcher approximated that the “n” for the study would be at least 47. In
this case, 79 questionnaires were returned, thus 79 was the sample size for this research. The list of elementary schools was taken from the State of Illinois, Department of Education website (www.isbe.state.il.us, 2010). The presumption was that even if the building administrator does not have a male teaching in the building currently, s/he would still add valuable perspective to the research study. Even if an administrator responded who did not currently have a male teaching, nor if this administrator has ever supervised a male elementary classroom teacher, the experience in that position may have opened the eyes of that administrator to potential stereotypes that would contribute to this research. It is true that if an administrator currently has, or has in his or her past supervised, a male elementary classroom teacher there may be more data to discover. However, to eliminate an administrator at the elementary level simply because he or she does not currently have a male classroom teacher would be to close off potential research that could add to this study.

**Questionnaire Design**

The researcher designed the Role of the Administrator Questionnaire as the primary method of obtaining responses to the aims of this research study. The researcher hoped that the perceptions of the administrators of their own relationships with male elementary teachers would address the primary research questions. This research study examined the experiences of elementary school administrators to determine what role, if any, they have in the professional lives of male elementary school teachers.

The questionnaire was one page in length, and double sided. It consisted of 11 demographic questions, 11 questions using a fully anchored rating scale, and 5 open-
ended questions. The 11 demographic questions focused on the age, race, and experience of the respondent, as well as the number of males (if any) who are classroom teachers.

Following the demographic sections were 11 questions that were designed to assess the awareness that building administrators had with the experience of male elementary school teachers. These questions were written with the fully anchored rating scale “because these are very popular with educational researchers and have been shown to work quite well” (Johnson & Christensen, 2004). These questions were designed to inform research question 1: What are administrators’ perceptions of the various stereotypes that men face as classroom teachers at the elementary level?

There were five questions following the fully anchored rating scale questions. They were open-ended, qualitative, short answer questions that focused on the perceptions of the building administrator when it came to male elementary school teachers. These questions were designed to inform research question 2: Given the challenges that men face who choose to teach at the elementary level, what does an administrator need to do to help these men maintain success and be effective in the classroom?

The questionnaire was not marked in any way for the researcher to be able to identify the respondent, ensuring anonymity. When it comes to protecting research participants, “privacy is generally the foremost concern” (Glesne, 2006, p. 138). It is paramount for the ethics of research but also for the purposes of this study that participants were assured that the researcher had no way of determining their identity. The researcher wanted to ensure that those participating felt welcome to share their
candid and honest opinion about the relationship between a building administrator and a male elementary classroom teacher. This protection existed so that when published, this research did no harm to anyone.

**Questionnaire Informal Focus Group**

The first draft of the questionnaire was shared with an informal focus group, comprised of Catholic school principals and administrators. The choice of this group was made because the researcher meets monthly with other principals and administrators in the Diocese of Burlington. This group of current administrators was able to share feedback with the researcher about the questionnaire before it was sent to the sample group. Based on the feedback from the group, the following changes were made to the questionnaire:

- Added the word “are” to the fifth demographic question: How many teachers are in your building?
- Removed “at the elementary level” from the eleventh question in the table as it was redundant.

**Data Collection**

A first cover letter was attached to all questionnaires (found in Appendix B). This letter introduced the researcher and the research, gave instructions for the completion of the questionnaire (found in Appendix A) and how to return it to the researcher, as well as confirmed the anonymity of the process. A cover letter, the questionnaire, and a self-addressed stamped return envelope were sent in an envelope addressed to every elementary school principal in Cook County, Illinois, exclusive of the City of Chicago.
within the sample criteria as listed above. No item that was sent to the sampled
principals was marked in any way to identify the respondent, preserving anonymity. For
the purposes of protection from any potential harm, this anonymity ensured that the
researcher maintained the privacy of the research participants. Johnson and Christensen
(2004) state “because it is impossible to know how people might interpret responses or
what responses might have adverse consequences for the participant, maintaining the
participant’s anonymity is recommended” (p. 112).

Four weeks after mailing the initial questionnaire, a second mailing was sent to all
those who received one. A second cover letter (found in Appendix C) accompanied this
mailing. The purpose was to remind the building administrators to complete the
questionnaire and return it to the researcher in the self-addressed stamped return
envelope, as well as thanking them for contributing to the research.

Two weeks after sending the second mailing, a reminder post card (found in
Appendix D) was sent to all who received an initial questionnaire. The purpose was to
remind the building administrators one final time to complete the questionnaire and
return it to the researcher in the self-addressed stamped return envelope, as well as
thanking them for contributing to the research.

All questionnaires were sent to a rented Post Office box, rented at the researcher’s
local Post Office. They were stored in a locked cabinet and destroyed after the research
study was completed. No one other than the researcher had access to the cabinet and/or
the completed questionnaires. Once again, to avoid an ethical dilemma, the researcher
was in complete control of the questionnaires once they were returned. The researcher
had “power disproportionately located” on his side and made every effort to ensure that full anonymity of all research participants was protected (Glesne, 2006, p. 138).

**Data Analysis**

The first 11 questions were strictly demographic in nature and were analyzed and represented as a percentage of participants responding for each demographic category. This section provided data sorts for later analysis and interpretation of the 5 open ended questions.

The next 11 questions were part of the fully anchored rating scale and were represented as a percentage of participants responding for each question. Qualitative research “investigates poorly understood territories of human interactions” and this study aimed to address the relationship of an administrator with his/her male elementary teachers (Glesne, 2006). Through the analysis of these 11 questions, the researcher hoped to uncover what the landscape of the relationship that an administrator has with male elementary teachers.

The final five questions were open response questions, and focused on the administrators’ perceptions of, and insight into, the professional life of the male elementary school teacher. With the aim of qualitative research being further understanding of a socially constructed reality, the researcher is charged with “fitting the pieces together and finding meaning in the whole” (Glesne, 2006). Through the analysis of these open ended questions, the desire was to make sense of the larger picture of the relationship between an administrator and male elementary classroom teachers.
This analysis of qualitative data is, as Glesne (2006), noted a way to find meaning in the whole. To bring this data to life, the researcher looked for patterns based on the current literature in the 11 statements from the fully anchored rating scale. Further, the researcher tried to identify possible new themes to organize the responses of the participants. With the combination of open ended questions to elaborate on the 11 questions from the fully anchored rating scale, the researcher hoped to report richly from the “inner world of each participant” in the study (Johnson & Christensen, 2004).

Following pattern and theme identification, the data was pattern coded. This allowed for patterns among the respondents to be represented. According to Miles and Huberman (1994), when a researcher is working with text, one notes “recurring patterns, themes, or ‘gestalts,’ which pull together many separate pieces of data (p. 246). Further, Patton (1987) points out that interpretation involves “attaching meaning and significance to the analysis, explaining descriptive patterns, and looking for relationships and linkages among descriptive dimensions” (p. 144). The patterns that emerge were considered in light of the research presented in the literature review.

Finally, data was sorted by some of the demographic information that was collected in the first 11 questions of the questionnaire. The researcher sorted the data by age of the principal, gender of the principal, and identified race of the principal. Data was represented in percentage of participants responding, as well as the percentages across the fully anchored rating scale. Charts were utilized to assist with the interpretation and the presentation of the data.
Ethical Considerations

“Treatment of research participants is the most important and fundamental issue that researchers must confront” (Johnson & Christensen, 2004). To this end, great care was taken to ensure the anonymity of the building administrators in this study. Since there may be men in the buildings where these principals are currently working, those participating in this study needed to know that their responses were anonymous and confidential, and there was no way the researcher can identify a particular principal.

The cover letter fully explained the research purpose and safeguards so that the building administrators were informed and assured that their responses remained anonymous and confidential. To that end, no identifying marks were placed on the questionnaire or return envelope. This way, all questionnaires were anonymous. If a building administrator chose not to be in the study, he/she simply did not respond. A completed, returned survey was indication of consent. Informed consent contributes to the empowering of research participants (Glesne, 2006). Additionally, respondents chose to not answer any question that they did not wish to answer. Research ethics (Glesne, 2006; Johnson & Christensen, 2004) dictate that participation is voluntary and the participant can withdraw and/or refuse to participate at any time with no penalty.

The potential benefits that hopefully arose from this research were indicated in the cover letter, so that the building administrators believed the anonymity and saw the purpose and value that could be gained by participating.
Limitations

There were four noted limiting factors to this study:

1. The sample of respondents may not represent a truly random sample of building principals in Cook County, Illinois, exclusive of Chicago. To maintain anonymity, the researcher did not follow-up with specific individuals, thus the researcher had no control over who completed and returned the questionnaires. It was possible that the returned questionnaires may be more reflective of certain demographic groups and therefore it was not truly a random sampling.

2. Generalizing the results outside of Cook County, Illinois, exclusive of Chicago, to religious/parochial schools, schools that did not fit the sampling criteria, or schools that did not respond to the questionnaire was not possible due to the limitations of data collection. This data was not representative of other states or types of schools.

3. Further generalizing was not be possible due to the researcher’s theme, pattern identification, and coding as it was a subjective process.

4. Finally, generalizing was limited due to the participants’ understanding and response to the questions. The researcher was unable to clarify questions; participants may have read questions differently and thus answer in a way that was not intended.

Despite these limitations, this research was important because the relationship between a male elementary classroom teacher and his building administrator has not been
examined thoroughly. The fact is that there are few male elementary classroom teachers and while the reasons for this have been discussed in Chapter II, how an administrator impacts the professional life of a classroom teacher is largely ripe for investigation.

**Bias Minimization**

To minimize bias, and given that the researcher is currently a male Catholic high school administrator, Catholic schools were involved only in the informal focus group and will not be part of the sampling. There are no public schools in Cook County, Illinois, exclusive of the City of Chicago that have any connection to the researcher.

Since the researcher is a current administrator and former elementary school teacher, he kept a journal while organizing and analyzing data. If there was a point in the analysis when he felt his own experiences as an elementary school teacher and/or an administrator were present, he took a break and wrote in a journal in an effort to maintain focus and avoid bias. “The notion of a comprehensive reflective journal to address the researcher’s self is critical in qualitative work because of the fact that the researcher is the research instrument” (Janesick, 2004, p. 144). Qualitative researchers have been accused of being less than precise; journal writing is an avenue for the researcher to remain clear about the role s/he plays in the project (Janesick, 2004).

**Summary**

To summarize, a qualitative questionnaire was mailed to building administrators of public elementary schools in Cook County, Illinois, exclusive of the City of Chicago, containing a pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, but not containing a sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, eleventh, or twelfth grade. The completed questionnaires were mailed back
to the researcher and an unbiased analysis of the responses was completed. The questionnaire contained 27 questions in total, 11 of which were demographic, 11 of which utilized a fully anchored rating scale, and 5 open ended. The questions were designed to examine the research questions:

1) What are administrators’ perceptions of the various stereotypes that men face as classroom teachers at the elementary level?

2) Given the challenges that men face who choose to teach at the elementary level, what does an administrator need to do to help these men maintain success and be effective in the classroom?
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF DATA

The purpose of this qualitative study is to examine what role, if any, a principal has in the professional life of male elementary classroom teachers. This study investigated a relationship that has yet to be explored thoroughly. The primary research question is what is the role that a principal has in the professional lives of male elementary classroom teachers?

Specifically the fundamental research questions are:

1) What are administrators’ perceptions of the various stereotypes that men face as classroom teachers at the elementary level?

2) Given the challenges that men face who choose to teach at the elementary level, what does an administrator need to do to help these men maintain success and be effective in the classroom?

Chapter IV is intended to display the data gathered from both the quantitative and qualitative analysis of responses to The Role of the Principal Questionnaire that were distributed to 187 elementary principals in Cook County, Illinois, exclusive of the City of Chicago. Cook County, Illinois, exclusive of the City of Chicago was selected because of the high diversity of socio-economic status in the City of Chicago, leading to a large disparity in school funding. The City of Chicago was excluded so as not to skew the data.
Review of the Procedure

The researcher sent 187 qualitative questionnaires with explanatory cover letters to elementary principals in Cook County, Illinois, exclusive of the City of Chicago. Four weeks after the initial mailing, the researcher sent another packet of qualitative questionnaires with explanatory cover letters to the same 187 schools in Cook County, Illinois, exclusive of the City of Chicago. Two weeks after the second mailing, the researcher sent 187 reminder post cards to complete and return the survey to a rented P.O. Box.

At the conclusion of this six-week period of time, 79 responses had been completed and returned, for a return percentage rate of 42%. For the purposes of this study, the results of 79 responses received will be displayed and analyzed. All figures and percentages come from the total (n = 79) respondents except when noted otherwise.

Design of the Qualitative Questionnaire

Demographic Data

The first portion of The Role of the Administrator Questionnaire was designed to collect demographic data from the respondents. The first two items asked the principals to provide their age and gender. On the back side of the questionnaire, the first item asked the principals to identify his/her race.
As seen in Figure 1, the largest number of respondents was 51 years of age (n = 5) and those that declined to give their age (n = 5). The youngest respondent was 29 (n = 1) and the oldest respondent was 66 (n = 1). There were eight other ages where only one respondent corresponded to the age (n = 1): those ages were 39, 42, 47, 54, 56, 58, 61, and 64. Additionally, there were equal numbers of respondents were ages 34, 37, 41, 46 and 48 (n = 2), 32, 36, 38, 50, 52, 59 and 65 (n = 3), 35, 43, 44, 53, 55, 57 and 60 (n = 4).

**Gender**

Sixty-three percent of the participants (n = 50) in this study (see Figure 2) were female, one-third were male (n = 26) and four (n = 3) did not answer the question.
Gender of Principals

- Male: 33%
- Female: 63%
- n/a: 4%

(n = 79)

Figure 2: Gender of Principals

Race

Of those that responded to *The Role of the Principal Questionnaire*, 79% (n = 62) identified their race as “White,” 16% (n = 13) identified their race as “Black, African-American,” and 5% (n = 4) did not identify their race (see Figure 3).

Identified Race of Principals

- White: 79%
- Black, African-American: 16%
- n/a: 5%

(n = 79)

Figure 3: Race of Principals
There were eight questions that asked the participants about their own experience in education, as well as demographic information about the teachers in their building.

**Years Teaching Prior to First Administrative Position**

The first question regarding the principals’ experience asked each respondent to identify how many years the principal taught before his/her first administrative position. The answers ranged from 29 years (n = 1) to 0 (n = 1). Thirteen percent (n = 10) of respondents taught for five years prior to the first administrative position and 11% (n = 9) taught for seven years before moving into administration. Eight percent of respondents (n = 6) were in the classroom for both 6 and 20 years. Six percent of those in the study (n = 5) taught for 10, 12, and 15 years. Five percent of the respondents (n = 4) were teachers for 13 and 17 years and three respondents each (n = 3) indicated they were in the classroom for 8, 11, and 18 years respectively. Finally, two principals (n = 2) taught for 9 and 23 years, while one respondent (n = 1) each indicated 14, 21, 24, and 25 years. One participant (n = 1) did not answer this question. Figure 4 represents this data.

**Figure 4: Prior Teaching Experience**
**Teaching at the PK – 5 Level**

The next question asked the principals to identify how many years s/he taught at the PK – 5 level. Twenty-five percent (n = 20) reported zero years of teaching experience at the PK – 5 level. The next largest percentage was eight (n = 6) that indicated five years of teaching experience at this level. Six percent (n = 5) responded 2, 6, 10, and 20 years of experience at this level. Five percent (n = 4) of those participating in the study taught for 11 years. An equal number of respondents indicated 1, 4, 9, and 12 years of teaching experience at the PK – 5 level (n = 3), 3, 13, 18, and 23 years PK – 5 teaching (n = 2), and 14, 15, 17, and 19 years teaching at the PK – 5 level (n = 1). One participant did not respond to this question. Figure 5 represents this data.

![PK - 5 Teaching Experience](image)

*Figure 5: PK – 5 Teaching Experience*
Years in Administration

The following question asked the principals to indicate how many years s/he has been in an administrative position. Thirteen percent of the responding principals (n = 10) have been in administration for 10 years. The smallest number of respondents (n = 1) has been in administration for 2, 15, 23, 24, 30, 31, and 34 years, respectively. Two principals each (n = 2) reported 1, 13, 16, 17, 22, and 25 years of administrative experience. Three participants (n = 3) indicated 5, 7, 14, and 20 years in administration. Five percent (n = 4) of those in this study have been in administration for eight and nine years, while 6% (n = 5) have held an administrative position for 6 and 12 years. Nine percent of the respondents (n = 7) have four years of administrative experience and 10% (n = 8) have 11 years in administration. One participant did not respond to this question. Figure 6 represents this data.

![Graph showing Years in Administration](image)

**Figure 6:** Years in Administration

(n = 79)
Administrative Years at the Elementary Level

The fourth question relating to principal experience asked the participants to indicate the number of administrative years spent at the elementary level. Thirteen percent (n = 10) have been at the elementary level for 10 years. Nine percent (n = 7) have been in elementary administration for eight years. Eight percent (n = 6) have been an elementary administrator for one and three years, respectively. Five participants (n = 5) have been at the elementary level for two years. Four respondents (n = 4) have been elementary administrators for 4, 5, 6, and 11 years, respectively. Three principals (n = 3) reported years in elementary administration of 9, 12, 14, 15, and 17 years. Two administrators (n = 2) indicated 7, 13, and 22 years of experience at the elementary level. Finally, one respondent (n = 1) indicated experience for each of the following years: 16, 18, 20, 24, 30, and 34 years. One participant did not respond to this question. The data is shown in Figure 7.

Figure 7: Elementary Administrative Experience
**Other Administrative Experience**

The fifth question asked the participating principals if they have been an administrator at another level. Fifty-three percent (n = 42) reported they did not, 46% (n = 36) reported they did have other administrative experience. One participant did not respond to this question. The data is displayed below (see Figure 8).

![Other Administrative Experience](image)

(n = 79)

*Figure 8: Other Administrative Experience*

**Teachers in the Building**

The next question asked the participants to report the number of teachers in his/her building. There were 18 different single responses (n = 1): 7, 10, 12, 13, 18, 22, 36, 37, 39, 41, 42, 45, 51, 52, 62, 65, 80, and 87. There were five instances in which two principals (n = 2) reported the same number: 16, 32, 38, 48, and 75. In three instances, three principals (n = 3) had identical numbers of teachers in their buildings: 8, 24, and 50. Four participants (n = 4) have 26 teachers in the building, five respondents (n = 5) have 35 teachers in the building. Six respondents (n = 6) reported numbers of teachers totaling
20, 25, and 40, respectively. Finally, 13% (n = 10) teachers reported 30 teachers in the building. One participant did not answer the question. The data is shown in Figure 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Teachers</th>
<th>Building Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n = 79)

**Figure 9: Building Teachers**

**Male Teachers versus Male Classroom Teachers**

The final two questions asked the respondents to identify both the total number of men who are teachers in the building, as well as detailing the number of men who are classroom teachers. The distinction to note here is that perhaps there is a male teaching Physical Education or some other specialty to individual classes that rotate through during the course of a school day. For the purposes of this study, a classroom teacher is one that spends his/her entire day with the same classroom of students. Eight respondents (n = 8) indicated no male teachers in the building, thus no male classroom teachers.

Twenty-two percent (n = 17) reported one male teacher in the building, and of those, four (n = 4) noted that the one male teacher is also a classroom teacher. The remaining 13 (n = 13) indicated that there are no male classroom teachers.
Twenty-two percent (n = 17) also reported two male teachers in the building. Of those, six (n = 6) reported that those two male teachers are classroom teachers. Four (n = 4) of these principals indicated one of the two male teachers as classroom teachers. The remaining seven (n = 7) responded that there are no male classroom teachers.

Nineteen percent (n = 15) reported three male teachers in the building. Of those, four (n = 4) reported that all three are classroom teachers, three (n = 3) responded that two of the three are classroom teachers, and six (n = 6) noted one of the three is a classroom teacher. Finally, two (n = 2) responded that there are no male classroom teachers.

Sixteen percent (n = 13) noted four male teachers in the building. Of those, four (n = 4) indicated that all four are classroom teachers, one (n = 1) reported that three are classroom teachers, four (n = 4) responded that two of the four are classroom teachers, and four (n = 4) noted that one is a classroom teacher.

Five principals (n = 5) responded that there are six male teachers in the building. Of those, two (n = 2) indicated that all six are classroom teachers, two (n = 2) noted four of the six are classroom teachers, and two (n = 2) reported three of the six as classroom teachers.

One principal each (n = 1) reported 7, 10, and 12 male teachers respectively. Of those, four, six, and eight, respectively are classroom teachers.

One participant did not report any data for these questions. The data is shown in Figure 10.
Perceptions of Stereotypes Faced by Male Elementary Classroom Teachers

The next section of The Role of the Principal Questionnaire asked the participants of the study to respond to 11 questions, using a fully anchored rating scale.

Question 1: I Am Aware of the Various Stereotypes Regarding Male Elementary Teachers

Figure 10: Male Teachers vs. Male Classroom Teachers

Figure 11: Awareness of Stereotypical Thinking
As the data from Figure 11 indicates, 47% (n = 38) agreed with the statement and an additional 19% (n = 15) strongly agreed, acknowledging the presence of stereotypes regarding male elementary teachers. Twenty-two percent (n = 17) responded neutral, while 9% (n = 7) disagreed and only 3% (n = 2) strongly disagreed. All participants responded to this question.

Of those who indicated strong agreement (n = 15), 80% (n = 12) were White and 20% (n = 3) were Black, African-American; 40% (n = 6) were male and 60% (n = 9) were female; 33% (n = 5) under the age of 45, 60% (n = 9) were over the age of 45 and one respondent did not give an age.

![Awareness of Stereotypical Thinking - Strong Agreement By Race](n=15)

*Figure 12: Awareness of Stereotypical Thinking – Strong Agreement By Race*
Awareness of Stereotypical Thinking - Strong Agreement By Gender

Male 40%
Female 60%
(n = 15)

Figure 13: Awareness of Stereotypical Thinking – Strong Agreement By Gender

Awareness of Stereotypical Thinking - Strong Agreement By Age

Over 45 60%
Under 45 33%
n/a 7%
(n = 15)

Figure 14: Awareness of Stereotypical Thinking – Strong Agreement By Age
Of those who indicated agreement (n = 38), 79% (n = 30) were White, 13% were Black, African/American, and 8% (n = 3) did not identify race; 66% (n = 25) were female and 34% (n = 13) were male; 53% (n = 20) were over the age of 45 and 47% (n = 18) were under the age of 45.

*Figure 15: Awareness of Stereotypical Thinking – Agreement By Race*

*Figure 16: Awareness of Stereotypical Thinking – Agreement By Gender*


**Figure 17: Awareness of Stereotypical Thinking – Agreement By Age**

Of those respondents that chose neutral (n = 17), 82% (n = 14) were White and 18% (n = 3) were Black, African-American; 64% (n = 11) were female, 24% (n = 4) were male, and 12% (n = 2) did not identify gender; 59% (n = 10) were over the age of 45, 29% (n = 5) were under the age of 45 and 12% (n = 2) did not indicate their age.

**Figure 18: Awareness of Stereotypical Thinking – Neutral By Race**
Awareness of Stereotypical Thinking - Neutral By Gender

Male 24%
Female 64%
n/a 12%

(n = 17)

Figure 19: Awareness of Stereotypical Thinking – Neutral By Gender

Awareness of Stereotypical Thinking - Neutral By Age

Over 45 59%
Under 45 29%
n/a 12%

(n = 17)

Figure 20: Awareness of Stereotypical Thinking – Neutral By Age

Of the respondents that disagreed (n = 7), 72% (n = 5) were White, 14% (n = 1) were Black, African-American, and 14% (n = 1) did not indicate race; 57% (n = 4) were female, 29% (n = 2) were male and 14% (n = 1) did not report their gender; 42% (n = 3)
were over the age of 45, 29% (n = 2) were under the age of 45, and 29% (n = 2) did not indicate their age.

**Figure 21: Awareness of Stereotypical Thinking – Disagreement By Race**

**Figure 22: Awareness of Stereotypical Thinking – Disagreement By Gender**
Figure 23: Awareness of Stereotypical Thinking – Disagreement By Age

Of the respondents that indicated strong disagreement (n = 2), 50% (n = 1) was White and 50% (n = 2) was Black, African-American; 50% (n = 1) was female and 50% (n = 1) was male; both respondents (n = 2) were over the age of 45.

Figure 24: Awareness of Stereotypical Thinking – Strong Disagreement By Race
Awareness of Stereotypical Thinking - Strong Disagreement

By Gender

Female 50%
Male 50%

(n = 2)

Figure 25: Awareness of Stereotypical Thinking – Strong Disagreement By Gender

Awareness of Stereotypical Thinking - Strong Disagreement

By Age

Under 45 0%
Over 45 100%

(n = 2)

Figure 26: Awareness of Stereotypical Thinking – Strong Disagreement By Age
Question 2: I Have Teachers in the Building Who Have Expressed Stereotypical Thinking Regarding Male Elementary Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n = 79)

*Figure 27: Stereotypical Thinking – Building Teachers*

From the data in Figure 27, it is noted that 42% (n = 33) disagreed with this statement and 25% (n = 20) strongly disagreed. Fifteen percent (n = 12) agreed with this statement, 14% (n = 11) responded neutral and 4% (n = 3) strongly agreed. All participants responded to this question.

Of those that indicated strong agreement (n = 3), all (n = 3) were White, none (n = 0) were Black, African-American; 67% (n = 2) were male and 33% (n = 1) was female; 33% (n = 1) was over the age of 45 and 67% (n = 2) were under the age of 45.
**Figure 28:** Stereotypical Thinking From Building Teachers – Strong Agreement By Race

**Figure 29:** Stereotypical Thinking From Building Teachers – Strong Agreement By Gender
Stereotypical Thinking From Building Teachers – Strong Agreement By Age

Of those that agreed with this statement (n = 12), 75% (n = 9) were White and 25% (n = 3) were Black, African-American; 83% (n = 10) were male and 17% (n = 2) were female; 42% (n = 5) were over the age of 45 and 58% (n = 7) were under the age of 45.

Stereotypical Thinking From Building Teachers – Agreement By Race

Figure 31: Stereotypical Thinking From Building Teachers – Agreement By Race
Of those that indicated a neutral response ($n = 11$), 82% ($n = 9$) were White and 18% ($n = 2$) were Black, African-American; 73% ($n = 8$) were female and 27% ($n = 3$) were male; 55% ($n = 6$) were under the age of 45, 27% ($n = 3$) were under the age of 45, and 18% ($n = 2$) did not indicate their age.
Stereotypical Thinking From Building Teachers - Neutral By Race

Figure 34: Stereotypical Thinking From Building Teachers – Neutral By Race

Figure 35: Stereotypical Thinking From Building Teachers – Neutral By Gender
Of those that disagreed (n = 33), 73% (n = 24) were White, 24% (n = 8) were Black, African-American, and 3% (n = 1) did not identify race; 67% (n = 22) were female, 27% (n = 9) were male, and 6% (n = 2) did not identify their gender; 73% (n = 24) were over the age of 45, 24% (n = 8) were under the age of 45 and 3% (n = 1) did not indicate their age.

Figure 37: Stereotypical Thinking From Building Teachers – Disagreement By Race
Of those that indicated strong disagreement (n = 20), 80% (n = 16) were White, 5% (n = 1) were Black, African-American, and 15% (n = 3) did not identify their race; 85% (n = 17) were female, 10% (n = 2) were male, and 5% (n = 1) did not identify their
gender; 55% (n = 11) were over the age of 45, 35% (n = 7) were under the age of 45 and 10% (n = 2) did not indicate their age.

![Stereotypical Thinking From Building Teachers - Strong Disagreement By Race](image1)

**Figure 40:** Stereotypical Thinking From Building Teachers – Strong Disagreement By Race

![Stereotypical Thinking From Building Teachers - Strong Disagreement By Gender](image2)

**Figure 41:** Stereotypical Thinking From Building Teachers – Strong Disagreement By Gender
Figure 42: Stereotypical Thinking From Building Teachers – Strong Disagreement By Age

Question 3: I Know of Men Who Have Left Teaching Because of the Stereotypes Regarding Elementary Teachers

Figure 43: Knowledge of Men That Left Elementary Teaching

As the data indicates in Figure 43, 55% (n = 43) of principals in the study disagreed with this statement and an additional 30% (n = 24) strongly disagreed. Eleven
percent (n = 9) responded neutral, with 1% (n = 1) strongly agreed and 0% (n = 0) agreed. Three percent (n = 2) did not answer this question.

The one respondent that strongly agreed with this statement was a White, female, under the age of 45.

*Figure 44: Knowledge of Men That Left Elementary Teaching – Strong Agreement By Race*

*Figure 45: Knowledge of Men That Left Elementary Teaching – Strong Agreement By Gender*
Of the respondents that indicated a neutral response to this statement (n = 9), 56% (n = 5) were White, 22% (n = 2) were Black, African-American, and 22% (n = 2) did not indicate their race; 78% (n = 7) were female and 22% (n = 2) were male; 56% (n = 5) were over the age of 45, 33% (n = 3) were under the age of 45, and 11% (n = 1) did not indicate their age.

Figure 46: Knowledge of Men That Left Elementary Teaching – Strong Agreement By Age
Knowledge of Men That Left Elementary Teaching - Neutral By Race

- White: 56%
- Black, African-American: 22%
- n/a: 22%

(n = 9)

Figure 47: Knowledge of Men That Left Elementary Teaching – Neutral By Race

Knowledge of Men That Left Elementary Teaching - Neutral By Gender

- Female: 78%
- Male: 22%

(n = 9)

Figure 48: Knowledge of Men That Left Elementary Teaching – Neutral By Gender
Figure 49: Knowledge of Men That Left Elementary Teaching – Neutral By Age

Of the respondents that disagreed (n = 43), 86% (n = 37) were White and 14% (n = 6) were Black, African-American; 58% (n = 25) were female, 37% (n = 16) were male and 5% (n = 2) did not indicate their gender; 60% (n = 26) were over the age of 45, 35% (n = 15) were under the age of 45, and 5% (n = 2) did not indicate their age.

Figure 50: Knowledge of Men That Left Elementary Teaching – Disagreement By Race
Figure 51: Knowledge of Men That Left Elementary Teaching – Disagreement By Gender

Figure 52: Knowledge of Men That Left Elementary Teaching – Disagreement By Age

Of the respondents that indicated strong disagreement (n = 24), 79% (n = 19) were White, 13% (n = 3) were Black, African-American, and 8% (n = 2) did not identify their race; 63% (n = 15) were female, 33% (n = 8) were male, and 4% (n = 1) did not
identify their gender; 50% (n = 12) were over the age of 45, 42% (n = 10) were under the age of 45, and 8% (n = 2) did not indicate their age.

![Knowledge of Men That Left Elementary Teaching - Strong Disagreement By Race](image)

*(n = 24)*

**Figure 53:** Knowledge of Men That Left Elementary Teaching – Strong Disagreement By Race

![Knowledge of Men That Left Elementary Teaching - Strong Disagreement By Gender](image)

*(n = 24)*

**Figure 54:** Knowledge of Men That Left Elementary Teaching – Strong Disagreement By Gender
Figure 55: Knowledge of Men That Left Elementary Teaching – Strong Disagreement By Age

Of the respondents that gave no answer to this question (n = 2), one was a White, female over the age of 45 and the other was a Black, African-American, male under the age of 45.

Figure 56: Knowledge of Men That Left Elementary Teaching – No Answer By Race
**Knowledge of Men That Left Elementary Teaching - No Answer By Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(n = 2)*

*Figure 57: Knowledge of Men That Left Elementary Teaching – No Answer By Gender*

---

**Knowledge of Men That Left Elementary Teaching - No Answer By Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 45</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 45</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(n = 2)*

*Figure 58: Knowledge of Men That Left Elementary Teaching – No Answer By Age*
Question 4: I Know of Men Who Have Left Teaching at the Elementary Level and Have Continued Teaching at Another Level

*Figure 59: Men Leaving Elementary Teaching for Another Level*

From the data reported in Figure 59, 33% (n = 26) agreed with this statement, with 32% (n = 25) indicating disagreement. Eighteen percent (n = 14) strongly disagreed with 5% (n = 4) responding strong agreement. Eleven percent (n = 9) reported neutral and 1% (n = 1) did not answer the question.

Of those that indicated strong agreement (n = 4), 50% (n = 2) were Black, African-American, 25% (n = 1) were White, and 25% (n = 1) did not indicate their race; 100% (n = 4) of these respondents were female; 50% (n = 2) were over the age of 45, 25% (n = 1) were under the age of 45, and 25% (n = 1) did not indicate their age.
Knowledge of Men Leaving Elementary Teaching for Another Level - Strong Agreement By Race

(n = 4)

Figure 60: Knowledge of Men Leaving Elementary Teaching for Another Level – Strong Agreement By Race

Knowledge of Men Leaving Elementary Teaching for Another Level - Strong Agreement By Gender

(n = 4)

Figure 61: Knowledge of Men Leaving Elementary Teaching for Another Level – Strong Agreement By Gender
Figure 62: Men Leaving Elementary Teaching for Another Level – Strong Agreement By Age

Of those that agreed with this statement (n = 26), 85% (n = 22) were White and 15% (n = 4) were Black, African-American; 54% (n = 14) were female, 42% (n = 11) were male, and 4% (n = 1) did not indicate their gender; 54% (n = 14) were over the age of 45, 42% (n = 11) were under the age of 45, and 4% (n = 1) did not indicate their age.

Figure 63: Knowledge of Men Leaving Elementary Teaching for Another Level – Agreement By Race

(n = 26)
Knowledge of Men Leaving Elementary Teaching for Another Level - Agreement By Gender

Figure 64: Knowledge of Men Leaving Elementary Teaching for Another Level - Agreement By Gender

Knowledge of Men Leaving Elementary Teaching for Another Level - Agreement By Age

Figure 65: Knowledge of Men Leaving Elementary Teaching for Another Level - Agreement By Age

Of those that responded neutral (n = 9), 78% (n = 7) were White, 11% (n = 1) was Black, African-American, and 11% (n = 1) did not indicate their gender; 67% (n = 6)
were female and 33% (n = 3) were male; 56% (n = 5) were under the age of 45 and 44% (n = 4) were over the age of 45.

**Figure 66:** Knowledge of Men Leaving Elementary Teaching for Another Level – Neutral By Race

**Figure 67:** Knowledge of Men Leaving Elementary Teaching for Another Level – Neutral By Gender
Figure 68: Knowledge of Men Leaving Elementary Teaching for Another Level – Neutral By Age

Of those that disagreed (n = 25), 84% (n = 21) were White and 16% (n = 4) were Black, African-American; 72% (n = 18) were female, 20% (n = 5) were male and 8% (n = 2) did not indicate their gender; 64% (n = 16) were over the age of 45, 28% (n = 7) were under the age of 45 and 8% (n = 2) did not indicate their age.

Figure 69: Knowledge of Men Leaving Elementary Teaching for Another Level – Disagreement By Race
Knowledge of Men Leaving Elementary Teaching for Another Level - Disagreement By Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>n/a Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n = 25)

*Figure 70: Knowledge of Men Leaving Elementary Teaching for Another Level – Disagreement By Gender*

Knowledge of Men Leaving Elementary Teaching for Another Level - Disagreement By Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>n/a Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 45</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 45</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n = 25)

*Figure 71: Knowledge of Men Leaving Elementary Teaching for Another Level – Disagreement By Age*

Of those that strongly disagreed with this statement, (n = 14), 72% (n = 10) were White, 14% (n = 2) were Black, African-American, and 14% (n = 2) did not indicate their
race; 57% (n = 8) were female and 43% (n = 6) were male; 50% (n = 7) were over the age of 45, 43% (n = 6) were under the age of 45, and 7% (n = 1) did not indicate their age.

Figure 72: Knowledge of Men Leaving Elementary Teaching for Another Level – Strong Disagreement By Race

Figure 73: Knowledge of Men Leaving Elementary Teaching for Another Level – Strong Disagreement By Gender
Figure 74: Knowledge of Men Leaving Elementary Teaching for Another Level – Strong Disagreement By Age

The one respondent that did not answer this question was a White, female, over the age of 45.

Figure 75: Knowledge of Men Leaving Elementary Teaching for Another Level – No Answer By Race

(n = 1)
Figure 76: Knowledge of Men Leaving Elementary Teaching for Another Level – No Answer By Gender

Figure 77: Knowledge of Men Leaving Elementary Teaching for Another Level – No Answer By Age
Question 5: I Am Aware of the Challenges that Face Men in Particular at the Elementary Level

![Image: Awareness of Challenges to Male Elementary Teachers]

Figure 78: Awareness of Challenges to Male Elementary Teachers

The data in Figure 78 indicate that 48% (n = 38) of the principals in this study agreed with the statement, with an additional 14% (n = 11) reporting strong agreement. Twenty-three percent (n = 18) indicated disagreement with 15% (n = 12) responding neutral. No participants (n = 0) indicated strong disagreement. All participants answered this question.

Of those that indicated strong agreement (n = 11), 73% (n = 8) were White, 18% (n = 2) were Black, African-American, and 9% (n = 1) did not indicate their gender; 55% (n = 6) were male and 45% (n = 5) were female; 55% (n = 6) were over the age of 45, 36% (n = 4) were under the age of 45, and 9% (n = 1) did not indicate their age.
Figure 79: Awareness of Challenges to Male Elementary Teachers – Strong Agreement By Race

Figure 80: Awareness of Challenges to Male Elementary Teachers – Strong Agreement By Gender
Figure 81: Awareness of Challenges to Male Elementary Teachers – Strong Agreement By Age

Of those that agreed with this statement (n = 38), 77% (n = 29) were White, 18% (n = 7) were Black, African-American, and 5% (n = 2) did not indicate their race; 63% (n = 24) were female, 32% (n = 12) were male and 5% (n = 2) did not indicate their gender; 56% (n = 21) were over the age of 45, 39% (n = 15) were under the age of 45, and 5% (n = 2) did not indicate their age.

Figure 82: Awareness of Challenges to Male Elementary Teachers – Agreement By Race
Figure 83: Awareness of Challenges to Male Elementary Teachers – Agreement By Gender

Figure 84: Awareness of Challenges to Male Elementary Teachers – Agreement By Age

Of those who responded neutral (n = 12), 92% (n = 11) were White and 8% (n = 1) were Black, African-American; 59% (n = 7) were female, 33% (n = 4) were male, and 8% (n = 1) did not indicate their gender; 59% (n = 7) were over the age of 45, 33% (n = 4) were under the age of 45, and 8% (n = 1) did not indicate their age.
Figure 85: Awareness of Challenges to Male Elementary Teachers – Neutral By Race

Figure 86: Awareness of Challenges to Male Elementary Teachers – Neutral By Gender
Of those that disagreed (n = 18), 77% (n = 14) were White, 17% (n = 3) were Black, African-American, and 6% (n = 1) did not identify their race; 78% (n = 14) were female and 22% (n = 4) were male; 55% (n = 10) were over the age of 45, 39% (n = 7) were under the age of 45 and 6% (n = 1) did not indicate their age.

**Figure 88: Awareness of Challenges to Male Elementary Teachers – Disagreement By Race**
Figure 89: Awareness of Challenges to Male Elementary Teachers – Disagreement By Gender

Figure 90: Awareness of Challenges to Male Elementary Teachers – Disagreement By Age
Question 6: In General, I Receive More Teacher Concerns about Male Classroom Teachers at the Elementary Level than About the Female Teachers at the Elementary Level

Figure 91: Teacher Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers

From the data reported in Figure 91, 44% (n = 35) strongly disagreed with this statement, while an additional 33% (n = 26) responded with disagreement. Eleven percent of the participants (n = 9) reported neutral and 8% (n = 6) agreed. No participants (n = 0) strongly agreed with the statement. Four percent (n = 3) did not answer this question.

Of those respondents that agreed with the statement (n = 6), 67% (n = 4) were White and 33% (n = 2) were Black, African-American; 67% (n = 4) were male and 33% (n = 2) were female; 50% (n = 3) were over the age of 45 and 50% (n = 3) were under the age of 45.
Teacher Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers - Agreement By Race

- Black, African-American: 33%
- White: 67%

(n = 6)

*Figure 92: Teacher Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers – Agreement By Race*

Teacher Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers - Agreement By Gender

- Male: 67%
- Female: 33%

(n = 6)

*Figure 93: Teacher Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers – Agreement By Gender*
Of those respondents that indicated neutral (n = 9), 67% (n = 6) were White, 22% (n = 2) were Black, African-American, and 11% (n = 1) did not identify their race; 67% (n = 6) were female and 33% (n = 3) were male; 56% (n = 5) were over the age of 45, 33% (n = 3) were under the age of 45, and 11% (n = 1) did not indicate their age.

Figure 94: Teacher Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers – Agreement By Age

Figure 95: Teacher Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers – Neutral By Race
Figure 96: Teacher Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers – Neutral By Gender

Figure 97: Teacher Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers – Neutral By Age

Of those respondents that disagreed with this statement (n = 26), 77% (n = 20) were White, 19% (n = 5) were Black, African-American, and 4% (n = 1) did not identify their race; 58% (n = 15) were female, 38% (n = 10) were male, and 4% (n = 1) did not
identify their gender; 65% (n = 17) were over the age of 45, 31% (n = 8) were under the age of 45 and 4% (n = 1) did not indicate their age.

*Figure 98:* Teacher Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers – Disagreement By Race

*Figure 99:* Teacher Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers – Disagreement By Gender
Figure 100: Teacher Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers – Disagreement By Age

Of those respondents that indicated strong disagreement (n = 35), 83% (n = 29) were White, 14% (n = 5) were Black, African-American, and 3% (n = 1) did not identify their race; 71% were female, 23% (n = 8) were male, and 6% (n = 2) did not identify their gender; 57% (n = 20) were over the age of 45, 37% (n = 13) were under the age of 45, and 6% (n = 2) did not indicate their age.

Figure 101: Teacher Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers – Strong Disagreement By Race
Teacher Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers - Strong Disagreement By Gender

- Female: 71%
- Male: 23%
- n/a: 6%

Figure 102: Teacher Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers – Strong Disagreement By Gender

Teacher Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers - Strong Disagreement By Age

- Under 45: 37%
- Over 45: 57%
- n/a: 6%

Figure 103: Teacher Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers – Strong Disagreement By Age

Of those respondents that gave no answer (n = 3), 67% (n = 2) were White and 33% (n = 1) did not indicate their race; 67% (n = 2) were female, and 33% (n = 1) were male; 67% (n = 2) were under the age of 45 and 33% (n = 1) did not indicate their age.
**Figure 104:** Teacher Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers – No Answer By Race

**Figure 105:** Teacher Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers – No Answer By Gender
Figure 106: Teacher Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers – No Answer By Age

Question 7: In General, I Receive More Parent Concerns About Male Classroom Teachers at the Elementary Level Than About the Female Classroom Teachers at the Elementary Level

Figure 107: Parent Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers
From the data in Figure 107, 46% (n = 37) strongly disagreed with this statement, with an additional 32% (n = 25) reporting disagreement. Thirteen percent (n = 10) responded neutral with 5% (n = 4) indicating agreement. No participant (n = 0) reported strong agreement. Four percent (n = 3) did not answer this question.

Of the respondents that indicated agreement with this statement (n = 4), 100% (n = 4) were White; 75% (n = 3) were male and 25% (n = 1) were female; 75% (n = 3) were over the age of 45 and 25% (n = 1) were under the age of 45.

\[\text{Figure 108: Parent Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers – Agreement By Race}\]
Figure 109: Parent Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers – Agreement By Gender

![Pie Chart: Parent Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers - Agreement By Gender]

(n = 4)

Figure 110: Parent Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers – Agreement By Age

![Pie Chart: Parent Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers - Agreement By Age]

(n = 4)

Figure 110: Parent Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers – Agreement By Age

Of the respondents that gave a neutral response (n = 10), 60% (n = 6) were White, 30% (n = 3) were Black, African-American, and 10% (n = 1) did not indicate their race; 70% (n = 7) were female and 30% (n = 3) were male; 70% (n = 7) were over the age of 45, 20% (n = 2) were under the age of 45, and 10% (n = 1) did not indicate their age.
Figure 111: Parent Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers – Neutral By Race

Figure 112: Parent Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers – Neutral By Gender
Of the respondents that disagreed with this statement (n = 25), 76% (n = 19) were White, 20% (n = 5) were Black, African-American, and 4% (n = 1) did not identify their race; 52% (n = 13) were female, 44% (n = 11) were male, and 4% (n = 1) did not identify their gender; 56% (n = 14) were over the age of 45, 40% (n = 10) were under the age of 45, and 4% (n = 1) did not indicate their age.
Figure 115: Parent Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers – Disagreement By Gender

Figure 116: Parent Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers – Disagreement By Age

Of the respondents that indicated strong disagreement (n = 37), 83% (n = 31) were White, 14% (n = 5) were Black, African-American, and 3% (n = 1) did not indicate their race; 73% (n = 27) were female, 22% (n = 8) were male, and 5% (n = 2) did not
indicate their gender; 60% (n = 22) were over the age of 45, 35% (n = 13) were under the age of 45, and 5% (n = 2) did not indicate their age.

![Parent Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers - Strong Disagreement By Race](image1.png)

(n = 37)

*Figure 117: Parent Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers – Strong Disagreement By Race*

![Parent Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers - Strong Disagreement By Gender](image2.png)

(n = 37)

*Figure 118: Parent Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers – Strong Disagreement By Gender*
Figure 119: Parent Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers – Strong Disagreement by Age

Of those respondents that gave no answer (n = 3), 67% (n = 2) were White and 33% (n = 1) did not indicate their race; 67% (n = 2) were female, and 33% (n = 1) were male; 67% (n = 2) were under the age of 45 and 33% (n = 1) did not indicate their age.

Figure 120: Parent Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers – No Answer By Race
Figure 121: Parent Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers – No Answer By Gender

(n = 3)

Figure 122: Parent Concerns Regarding Male Elementary Teachers – No Answer By Age

(n = 3)
Question 8: I Believe that the Needs of Male Elementary Teachers are Different than the Needs of Female Elementary Teachers

![Needs of Male Teachers Compared to Female Teachers](image)

(n = 79)

*Figure 123: Needs of Male Teachers Compared to Female Teachers*

The data in Figure 123 shows that 35% (n = 28) of participants agreed with this statement, with an additional 6% (n = 5) reporting strong agreement. Twenty-seven percent (n = 21) disagreed, with an additional 8% (n = 6) reporting strong disagreement. Twenty-four percent of respondents (n = 19) indicated neutral. All participants answered this question.

Of the respondents that indicated strong agreement (n = 5), 80% (n = 4) were White and 20% (n = 1) were Black, African-American; 60% (n = 3) were male and 40% (n = 2) were female; 80% (n = 4) were under the age of 45 and 20% (n = 1) did not indicate their age.
Figure 124: Needs of Male Teachers Compared to Needs of Female Teachers – Strong Agreement By Race

(n = 5)

Figure 125: Needs of Male Teachers Compared to Needs of Female Teachers – Strong Agreement By Gender

(n = 5)
Of the respondents that agreed with this statement (n = 28), 82% (n = 23) were White and 18% (n = 5) were Black, African-American; 68% (n = 19) were female and 32% (n = 9) were male; 68% (n = 19) were over the age of 45 and 32% (n = 9) were under the age of 45.

Figure 126: Needs of Male Teachers Compared to Needs of Female Teachers – Strong Agreement By Age

Figure 127: Needs of Male Teachers Compared to Needs of Female Teachers – Agreement By Race
Of those that indicated a neutral response (n = 19), 78% (n = 15) were White, 11% (n = 2) were Black, African-American, and 11% (n = 2) did not indicate their race;
48% (n = 9) were male, 47% (n = 9) were female, and 5% (n = 1) did not identify their gender; 52% (n = 10) were over the age of 45, 37% (n = 7) were under the age of 45, and 11% (n = 2) did not indicate their age.

**Figure 130:** Needs of Male Teachers Compared to Needs of Female Teachers – Neutral By Race

**Figure 131:** Needs of Male Teachers Compared to Needs of Female Teachers – Neutral By Gender
Of those that disagreed with this statement (n = 21), 81% (n = 17) were White, 14% (n = 3) were Black, African-American, and 5% (n = 1) did not indicate their race; 71% (n = 15) were female, 24% (n = 5) were male, and 5% (n = 1) did not indicate their gender; 52% (n = 11) were over the age of 45, 43% (n = 9) were under the age of 45, and 5% (n = 1) did not indicate their age.

Figure 133: Needs of Male Teachers Compared to Needs of Female Teachers – Disagreement By Race
Figure 134: Needs of Male Teachers Compared to Needs of Female Teachers – Disagreement By Gender

Figure 135: Needs of Male Teachers Compared to Needs of Female Teachers – Disagreement By Age

Of those that indicated strong disagreement \( (n = 6) \), 50% \( (n = 3) \) were White, 33% \( (n = 2) \) were Black, African-American and 17% \( (n = 1) \) did not indicate their race; 83%
(n = 5) were female and 17% (n = 1) did not indicate their gender; 66% (n = 4) were over the age of 45, 17% (n = 1) were under the age of 45, and 17% (n = 1) did not indicate their age.

**Figure 136**: Needs of Male Teachers Compared to Needs of Female Teachers – Strong Disagreement By Race

**Figure 137**: Needs of Male Teachers Compared to Needs of Female Teachers – Strong Disagreement By Gender
Figure 138: Needs of Male Teachers Compared to Needs of Female Teachers – Strong Disagreement By Age

Question 9: I am Supportive of Male Teachers Hugging their Students

Figure 139: Support for Male Teachers Hugging Students

As the data demonstrates in Figure 139, 31% (n = 25) of the participants reported neutral in response to this question. Twenty-seven percent (n = 21) agreed with the
statement and 27% (n = 21) disagreed with the statement. Ten percent (n = 8) strongly disagreed and 5% (n = 4) strongly agreed. All participants answered this question.

Of the respondents that strongly agreed (n = 4), 100% (n = 4) were White; 50% (n = 2) were female and 50% (n = 2) were male; 50% (n = 2) were over the age of 45 and 50% (n = 2) were under the age of 45.

*Figure 140:* Support for Male Teachers Hugging Students – Strong Agreement By Race

*Figure 141:* Support for Male Teachers Hugging Students – Strong Agreement By Gender
Support for Male Teachers Hugging Students - Strong Agreement By Age

(n = 4)

Figure 142: Support for Male Teachers Hugging Students – Strong Agreement By Age

Of the respondents that agreed with the statement (n = 21), 76% (n = 16) were White and 24% (n = 5) were Black, African-American; 66% (n = 14) were female, 29% (n = 6) were male, and 5% (n = 1) did not indicate their gender; 71% (n = 15) were over the age of 45, 24% (n = 5) were under the age of 45, and 5% (n = 1) did not indicate their age.

Support for Male Teachers Hugging Students - Agreement By Race

(n = 21)

Figure 143: Support for Male Teachers Hugging Students – Agreement By Race
Of the respondents that indicated a neutral response (n = 25), 76% (n = 19) were White, 16% (n = 4) were Black, African-American, and 8% (n = 2) did not indicate their race; 64% (n = 16) were female and 36% (n = 9) were male; 52% (n = 13) were over the age of 45, 44% (n = 11) were under the age of 45, and 4% (n = 1) did not indicate their age.
Support for Male Teachers Hugging Students – Neutral By Race

- Black, African-American: 16%
- White: 76%
- n/a: 8%

(n = 25)

Figure 146: Support for Male Teachers Hugging Students – Neutral By Race

Support for Male Teachers Hugging Students - Neutral By Gender

- Male: 36%
- Female: 64%

(n = 25)

Figure 147: Support for Male Teachers Hugging Students – Neutral By Gender
Support for Male Teachers Hugging Students – Neutral By Age

Of the respondents that disagreed (n = 21), 90% (n = 19) were White, 5% (n = 1) were Black, African-American, and 5% (n = 1) did not indicate their race; 66% (n = 14) were female, 29% (n = 6) were male, and 5% (n = 1) did not indicate their gender; 47% (n = 10) were over the age of 45, 48% (n = 10) were under the age of 45, and 5% (n = 1) did not indicate their age.

Support for Male Teachers Hugging Students – Disagreement By Race

Of the respondents that disagreed (n = 21), 90% (n = 19) were White, 5% (n = 1) were Black, African-American, and 5% (n = 1) did not indicate their race; 66% (n = 14) were female, 29% (n = 6) were male, and 5% (n = 1) did not indicate their gender; 47% (n = 10) were over the age of 45, 48% (n = 10) were under the age of 45, and 5% (n = 1) did not indicate their age.
Support for Male Teachers Hugging Students - Disagreement By Gender

- Male: 29%
- Female: 66%
- n/a: 5%
(n = 21)

Figure 150: Support for Male Teachers Hugging Students – Disagreement By Gender

Support for Male Teachers Hugging Students - Disagreement By Age

- Under 45: 48%
- Over 45: 47%
- n/a: 5%
(n = 21)

Figure 151: Support for Male Teachers Hugging Students – Disagreement By Age

Of those that indicated strong disagreement (n = 8), 49% (n = 4) were White, 38% (n = 3) were Black, African-American, and 13% (n = 1) did not indicate their race; 49% (n = 4) were female, 38% (n = 3) were male, and 13% (n = 1) did not indicate their
gender; 50% \((n = 4)\) were over the age of 45, 25% \((n = 2)\) were under the age of 45, and 25% \((n = 2)\) did not indicate their age.

Figure 152: Support for Male Teachers Hugging Students – Strong Disagreement By Race

Figure 153: Support for Male Teachers Hugging Students – Strong Disagreement By Gender
Support for Male Teachers Hugging Students - Strong Disagreement By Age

Over 45: 50%  
Under 45: 25%  
n/a: 25%

(n = 8)

Figure 154: Support for Male Teachers Hugging Students – Strong Disagreement By Age

Question 10: I am Supportive of Female Teachers Hugging their Students

Support for Female Teachers Hugging Students

Strongly Agree: 33%  
Agree: 32%  
Neutral: 24%  
Disagree: 6%  
Strongly Disagree: 5%

(n = 79)

Figure 155: Support for Female Teachers Hugging Students

The data in Figure 155 indicates 33% (n = 26) agreed with this statement, with an additional 5% (n = 4) noting strong agreement. Thirty-two percent (n = 25) responded
neutral. Twenty-four percent (n = 19) disagreed, with an additional 6% (n = 5) indicating strong disagreement. All participants answered this question.

Of those that indicated strong agreement (n = 4), 100% (n = 4) were White; 50% (n = 2) were male and 50% (n = 2) were female; 50% (n = 2) were over the age of 45 and 50% (n = 2) were under the age of 45.

*Figure 156: Support for Female Teachers Hugging Students – Strong Agreement By Race

*Figure 157: Support for Female Teachers Hugging Students – Strong Agreement By Gender*
Support for Female Teachers Hugging Students - Strong Agreement By Age

Of those that agreed with the statement (n = 26), 73% (n = 19) were White, 23% (n = 6) were Black, African-American, and 4% (n = 1) did not indicate their race; 61% (n = 16) were female, 35% (n = 9) were male, and 4% (n = 1) did not indicate their gender; 73% (n = 19) were over the age of 45, 19% (n = 5) were under the age of 45, and 8% (n = 2) did not indicate their age.

Support for Female Teachers Hugging Students - Agreement By Race

Figure 158: Support for Female Teachers Hugging Students – Strong Agreement By Age

Figure 159: Support for Female Teachers Hugging Students – Agreement By Race
Support for Female Teachers Hugging Students – Agreement By Gender

- Male: 35%
- Female: 61%
- n/a: 4%

(n = 26)

Figure 160: Support for Female Teachers Hugging Students – Agreement By Gender

Support for Female Teachers Hugging Students – Agreement By Age

- Over 45: 73%
- Under 45: 19%
- n/a: 8%

(n = 26)

Figure 161: Support for Female Teachers Hugging Students – Agreement By Age

Of those that indicated a neutral response (n = 25), 84% (n = 21) were White, 12% (n = 3) were Black, African-American, and 4% (n = 1) did not indicate their race; 64% (n = 16) were female, 32% (n = 8) were male, and 4% (n = 1) did not indicate their race.
gender; 56% (n = 14) were under the age of 45, 40% (n = 10) were over the age of 45, and 4% (n = 1) did not indicate their age.

Figure 162: Support for Female Teachers Hugging Students – Neutral By Race

Figure 163: Support for Female Teachers Hugging Students – Neutral By Gender
Figure 164: Support for Female Teachers Hugging Students – Neutral By Age

Of those that disagreed with the statement (n = 19), 78% (n = 15) were White, 11% (n = 2) were Black, African-American, and 11% (n = 2) did not indicate their race; 63% (n = 12) were female, 32% (n = 6) were male, and 5% (n = 1) did not indicate their gender; 47% (n = 9) were over the age of 45, 42% (n = 8) were under the age of 45, and 11% (n = 2) did not indicate their age.

Figure 165: Support for Female Teachers Hugging Students – Disagreement By Race
Of those that indicated strong disagreement (n = 5), 60% (n = 3) were White and 40% (n = 2) were Black, African-American; 80% (n = 4) were female and 20% (n = 1) were male; 80% (n = 4) were over the age of 45 and 20% (n = 1) were under the age of 45.
Support for Female Teachers Hugging Students - Strong Disagreement By Race

- Black, African-American: 40%
- White: 60%

(n = 5)

*Figure 168: Support for Female Teachers Hugging Students – Strong Disagreement By Race*

Support for Female Teachers Hugging Students - Strong Disagreement By Gender

- Male: 20%
- Female: 80%

(n = 5)

*Figure 169: Support for Female Teachers Hugging Students – Strong Disagreement By Gender*
Figure 170: Support for Female Teachers Hugging Students – Strong Disagreement By Age

Question 11: Men are as Effective Instructionally in the Classroom as Women

Figure 171: Men are as Effective Instructionally in the Classroom as Women

As the data in Figure 171 indicates, 62% (n = 49) of the principals in the study noted strong agreement with this statement and an additional 32% (n = 25) agreed. Six percent (n = 5) of the respondents reported neutral. No principals (n = 0) disagreed, nor
did any principals (n = 0) indicate strong disagreement with the statement. All participants answered this question.

Of those that indicated strong agreement (n = 49), 86% (n = 42) were White, 12% (n = 6) were Black, African-American, and 2% (n = 1) did not indicate their race; 74% (n = 36) were female, 22% (n = 11) were male, and 4% (n = 2) did not indicate their gender; 49% (n = 24) were over the age of 45, 41% (n = 20) were under the age of 45, and 10% (n = 5) did not indicate their age.

![Men as Effective Instructionally in the Classroom as Women - Strong Agreement By Race](image)

(n = 49)

*Figure 172: Men are as Effective Instructionally in the Classroom as Women – Strong Agreement By Race*
Figure 173: Men are as Effective Instructionally in the Classroom as Women – Strong Agreement By Gender

Figure 174: Men are as Effective Instructionally in the Classroom as Women – Strong Agreement By Age

Of those that agreed with this statement (n = 25), 76% (n = 19) were White, 12% (n = 3) were Black, African-American, and 12% (n = 3) did not indicate their race; 52%
(n = 13) were male and 48% (n = 12) were female; 64% (n = 16) were over the age of 45 and 36% (n = 9) were under the age of 45.

**Figure 175:** Men are as Effective Instructionally in the Classroom as Women – Agreement By Race

**Figure 176:** Men are as Effective Instructionally in the Classroom as Women – Agreement By Gender
Figure 177: Men are as Effective Instructionally in the Classroom as Women – Agreement by Age

Of those that indicated a neutral response (n = 5), 80% (n = 4) were Black, African-American and 20% (n = 1) were White; 40% (n = 2) were male, 40% (n = 2) were female, and 20% (n = 1) did not indicate their gender; 80% (n = 4) were over the age of 45 and 20% (n = 1) were under the age of 45.

Figure 178: Men are as Effective Instructionally in the Classroom as Women – Neutral By Race
Men as Effective Instructionally in the Classroom as Women - Neutral By Gender

![Pie Chart: Men as Effective Instructionally in the Classroom as Women - Neutral By Gender](image)

(n = 5)

*Figure 179: Men are as Effective Instructionally in the Classroom as Women – Neutral By Gender*

Men as Effective Instructionally in the Classroom as Women - Neutral By Age

![Pie Chart: Men as Effective Instructionally in the Classroom as Women - Neutral By Age](image)

(n = 5)

*Figure 180: Men are as Effective Instructionally in the Classroom as Women – Neutral By Age*
Open-Ended Responses

The final portion of The Role of the Principal Questionnaire asked participants to respond to five questions:

- How do you address and/or respond to the different needs of female and male elementary teachers in your building?
- If you have not had a male teacher in your building, what has led to this circumstance?
- How would you respond to a parent concerned with the fact that “Mr. Smith” was a male kindergarten teacher?
- Given the challenges that men may face in the classroom, what do you do to promote effective instruction?
- Why do you think there is a shortage of male teachers in elementary classrooms? (Current statistics from the Center for Evaluation & Education Policy place the percentage of men in elementary classrooms at 10%; other non-profits cite a lower percentage.)

Rather than presenting all of the responses to these five open-ended questions, the researcher will provide a sample of the responses for each question that reflect the various answers supplied by the principals in the study. In some instances, responses were very similar, so the researcher will represent such responses one time in this chapter. In addition, as there were multiple responses to some answers, percentages may not always reflect the number of responses (n = 77). There were two respondents (n = 2) that did not respond to one of the open-ended questions on the questionnaire.
How do you address and/or respond to the different needs of female and male elementary teachers in your building?

Thirty-nine percent (n = 30) of the responses to this question indicated that principals address the individual needs of the teachers. Participants stated that s/he tries to “meet the needs of individuals” and address them “individually.” As one principal wrote, “Every staff member has different needs. I try to respond accordingly.” Another respondent noted, “I honestly feel like I try to meet the needs of individuals – I like to differentiate (just like the teachers [differentiate for their students]).” Finally, one principal indicated, “I promote open and honest communication. I share what I perceive; they share their needs.”

In addition, 8% (n = 6) of the responses specifically noted that s/he makes an effort to meet the needs of the teachers, without consideration of gender. “I believe in supporting teachers, regardless of gender. I vary my approaches based on individual needs.” Another noted, “I don’t see a need to adjust my response to staff needs based on gender.” An additional principal wrote, “I respond to the need of ‘teachers’ in my building and their gender is insignificant.” Finally, one principal responded, “I try to focus on the needs of each individual teacher, rather than focus on male/female differences.”

Thirteen percent (n = 10) of respondents noted either that there is “no difference” in how s/he responds or that s/he responds “the same” to the different needs of female and male elementary teachers. One principal wrote, “I do not believe they have different needs.” Another simply noted, “No difference;” with another adding, “No difference in
approach,” and an additional respondent writing, “I’m not sure that I have had to do this.” Finally, a principal responded, “I respond the same.”

Ten percent (n = 8) of the participants in this study indicated that they do urge some form of “caution” when it comes to the male teachers in their building. One principal wrote, “I meet with the male teachers before the start of the year and discuss ‘no hugging.’” Another echoed this sentiment when s/he noted, “I tell male teacher[s] more strongly not to hug female students.” One principal stated clearly, “There are instances where males have to be more cautious and protect themselves from any misconceptions.” This was also echoed when another building administrator noted, “I handle student situations [differently] for male teachers when the situation may put the male teacher in a situation where they could be perceived as inappropriate.”

Five percent (n = 4) of respondents note it was a “non-issue,” 3% (n = 3) wrote “no males” in the building, and 10% (n = 8) had no response to this question or wrote “N/A”.

The remaining responses were unclear and/or did not address the question. One respondent wrote, “Males do not like change,” another principal noted, “My male teacher is very easy going,” and indicated that the only “issue with males has been when single moms flirt with male teachers.” In the case of the latter principal, there was no indication of what was done to address this.
If you have not had a male teacher in your building, what has led to this circumstance?

Seventy percent (n = 54) of the respondents have male teachers in the building. Of this 70%, 7% (n = 5) wrote that s/he has a male teacher in the building the remaining 93% (n = 49) either wrote “N/A” or left the question entirely blank.

Seventeen percent (n = 13) indicated that it was the lack of quality in the male applicants that has most directly led to this circumstance. One principal reported, “Up to this point, males have not been the best candidate for any particular position.” Another indicated, “I do not now [have male teachers in the building] because male applicants didn’t interview as strongly to emerge as a premier hire.” Still another building administrator stated, “We have not had any applicants for classroom positions.” Finally, one principal in the study wrote simply, “Few quality applicants. Very few.”

There was no pattern to the remaining responses, with some stating, “No males with tenure” (n = 1), “retired” (n = 1), “male teacher let go” (n = 1), and “unable to handle the job” (n = 1).

How would you respond to a parent concerned with the fact that “Mr. Smith” was a male kindergarten teacher?

Twenty-seven percent (n = 21) of the principals in the study responded to this question by indicating they would be very supportive of the male kindergarten teacher, specifically pointing out how “qualified” the teacher was, referring to his “skill set,” and that the teacher was addressing the “needs of the students.”

One principal wrote, “I would tell parents that Mr. Smith is a skilled and nurturing staff member that puts student needs at the center of his instructional planning.” Another
noted this response, “I would tell the parent that it is my responsibility to place teachers at positions to best meet the needs of the students.” Still another principal stated, “Mr. Smith is qualified to educate your child. His credentials are excellent. Your child will receive an excellent education.” Finally, one principal indicated, “I would explain his qualifications; I wouldn’t hire him unless he was highly qualified.”

Twelve percent (n = 9) were generally supportive of “Mr. Smith” with no specific pattern to the responses. One principal wrote, “I would welcome it [the conversation].” Another stated, “If I know that Mr. Smith is capable of teaching kindergartners, I will express this to the parent.” Finally, one principal in the study noted simply, “Be supportive – address parent concerns.”

Another twelve percent (n = 9) were again supportive but this time, there was a theme that gender was not an issue. One principal stated, “Give me academic concerns before gender concerns.” Another wrote, “The focus of the conversation would involve his instruction and effectiveness versus his gender.” Further, another principal in the study indicated, “I would say that gender is not an issue rather the pedagogical skills that the teacher possesses.” Finally, a principal wrote, “Listen, discuss, reassure. Focus on skill and credentials, not gender.”

Still another 12% (n = 9) were supportive of “Mr. Smith” and would invite parents to come in to the classroom to see what occurs for themselves. One principal in the study wrote, “Actually we had a male kindergarten teacher before and we invited parents to observe and visit the classroom frequently.” Another administrator noted, “Invite them to visit the class as well.” Still another stated, “If Mr. Smith was an
effective teacher, I’d invited that parent to dialogue with the teacher and also to come and visit to observe him in action.” Finally, one of the building principals wrote, “Listen, encourage parent to come in [to] volunteer in class and watch the interactions.”

Ten percent (n = 8) indicated they would address the specific concerns of the parents. Nine percent (n = 7) noted they would frame the situation positively by reminding parents of how important it is for young students to have male role models. One principal wrote, “I would present the situation as a positive one where the students will have another male role model in their life.” Another stated, “Lack of male (African-American) role models in the community.” Another principal in the study wrote, “I would address the teacher skill and that all children need more male (and female) role models.” Finally, one of the administrators noted, “It is wonderful for students to have a male role model.”

Eight percent (n = 6) of the respondents noted that they have no concerns about this happening, as they currently have a male in an early elementary classroom and have had no concerns raised about him.

Seven percent (n = 5) gave no response. The remaining responses had no pattern but ranged from assuring the parent “that male teachers are never alone with students” (n = 1), to “I would never hire a male Kindergarten teacher” (n = 1), and finally reassigning the student to another classroom (n = 1).
Given the challenges that men may face in the classroom, what do you do to promote effective instruction?

Twenty-nine percent (n = 22) of the principals in the study responded that effective instruction for male teachers is promoted through professional development. One principal stated, “They receive high quality professional development and are expected to implement best practice [in the classroom].” Another principal wrote, “Professional development differentiated for the needs of each staff member.” Yet another administrator noted, “Provide professional development for all teachers and implement initiatives that promote student achievement.” Finally, one principal in the study wrote, “Effective instruction requires professional development in best practice.”

An additional 23% (n = 18) stated that gender does not matter. One principal noted, “Effective instruction is not gender related.” Another wrote, “Best practice regardless of gender.” Another administrator stated, “Truly I do not look at gender but assessment.” Finally, one principal in the study wrote, “All of our teachers, regardless of gender, receive professional development, evaluation, [and] supervision, focused on growth and best practices, etc.”

Sixteen percent (n = 12) of the respondents wrote that there are no challenges specific to men in elementary classrooms and thus, nothing is done differently. One principal stated, “I don’t feel they face any more challenges than their colleagues.” Another administrator in the study noted, “There are no concerns, so we do not need to do anything differently.” Still another principal wrote, “I’m not aware of challenges that are specific to male elementary teachers.” Finally, one respondent in the study stated,
“The same effective practice that I would promote with females.” In addition, three percent (n = 2) simply stated, “Nothing” (n = 1) and “Nothing special” (n = 1) in response to this question.

Nine percent (n = 7) respondents indicated a specific response to the question, with no specific pattern or theme:

- “gender concerns (young girl gender issues)” (n = 1)
- “Male educators may have to put forth more effort to prove themselves” (n = 1)
- “professional, friendly but not familiar behavior” (n = 1)
- “positive and constructive feedback; men require frankness and openness” (n = 1)
- “The stereotype that male teachers are going to or should be able to diminish all behavior problems in a classroom is a challenge” (n = 1)
- “Classroom management” (n = 1)
- “Do not put yourself in one-on-one situations if possible” (n = 1)

Another 9% (n = 7) left the question blank, with one respondent writing “N/A”.

Finally, 7% (n = 5) of the principals in the study specifically pointed to collaboration as a way to promote effective instruction for males in the classroom. One principal wrote “Our teachers have common planning time one to two times a week. During those times, the teachers plan and discuss grade level issues, instructions, and curriculum.” Another principal from the data stated, “We continue to encourage professional learning communities for common planning time and collaboration so all team members are
prepared for instruction.” Yet another principal pointed out, “[We] recognize staff for effective instruction and allow ample time for staff members to collaborate with and observe one another.” Finally, one building administrator wrote, “My work with [the male teachers in my school] has focused on encouraging them to collaborate with their grade level teams more frequently.

Why do you think there is a shortage of male teachers in elementary classrooms?

(Current statistics from the Center for Evaluation & Education Policy place the percentage of men in elementary classrooms at 10%; other non-profits cite a lower percentage)

Sixty-nine percent (n = 53) of the principals in the study indicated that money and/or salary was the reason there are not more men in elementary classrooms. Several of the principals responded simply with one-word answers, “money,” “salary,” “pay,” and many elaborated. One principal wrote, “Money. Men have to take care of a family. Secondary education pays more.” Another principal stated, “There is more money at the high school level and in other fields.” Still another principal noted, “Junior High and High School districts pay more and as primary breadwinners, this is a factor.” Finally one building administrator wrote, “Men follow the money. Higher salaries in high school. It is and has always been about the cash.”

An additional 9% (n = 7) cited money, specifically related to the extracurricular and coaching opportunities available at the high school level. One principal from the study wrote, “Most men in education are in high school (coaching is important to them).” Another administrator reported, “More money at high school and middle school level –
coaching stipends and other extra-curricular sponsorships.” Yet another principal referred to this when it was noted, “Most male teachers I know are at the middle school or high school level based on coaching opportunities.” Finally, one administrator from this study wrote, “$ - most want to work where there are more extra curricular opportunities at junior high or high school.”

Fourteen percent (n = 11) of the respondents made reference to the “feminine” perception of elementary classroom teaching. One principal wrote, “Most [men] feel that it [high school] is a better fit, they don’t have to be as nurturing.” Another administrator from the study wrote, “I think that generally women teach in elementary schools because they are more nurturing with younger students.” One principal stated, “Schools can be feminine in nature at the elementary level.” Finally, one building administrator reported, “I think males may be affected by the perceptions regarding male teachers, nurses, and such.”

An additional 14% (n = 11) regarded stereotypes as a reason for the shortage of male teachers. A principal from the study wrote, “‘Traditional’ roles of males in upper education…and stereotypes of elementary education teachers as female only.” Another building administrator stated, “The cultural views that elementary teaching is for females.” Still another principal indicated that “the stereotype by the public that men are not caring enough, not patient enough.” Finally, one principal from the study wrote, “I think the stereotypes play a big part and the perception is still there that male elementary teachers are ‘gay.’”
Four percent (n = 3) of the respondents noted that men are not encouraged to teach at the elementary level. One principal stated, “I do not think it is encouraged at the college level.” Another building administrator from the study wrote, “Because they are not usually encouraged to pursue elementary positions.” Finally, one principal wrote, “Typically men aren’t encouraged to pursue teaching.”

An additional 4% (n = 3) of the principals referred to the concerns regarding pedophilia and men in elementary classrooms. One principal wrote, “They [male teachers] do not want issues of being accused of anything.” Another administrator noted, “The stigma of a non-masculine job or the stigma of being a pedophile.” Finally one principal from the study wrote simply, “All the concerns.”

The remaining responses ranged from “lacking the organizational skills” (n = 1), “the innate differences between men and women” (n = 1) and “N/A” (n = 1).

**Summary**

Chapter IV is intended to display the data gathered from qualitative analysis of responses to *The Role of the Principal Questionnaire* that were distributed to 187 principals in Cook County, Illinois, exclusive of the City of Chicago.

This chapter presented the data regarding the demographics of the respondents within the study (gender, age, race, years teaching prior to first administrative position, years teaching at the PK – 5 level, years in administration, administrative years at the elementary level, any administrative experience at another level, teachers in the building currently, current number of male teachers, and current number of male teachers),
responses to the eleven statements along the fully-anchored rating scale, and the open-ended responses to the five questions at the end of the questionnaire.

Chapter V will seek to identify common themes that emerge as a result of this presentation of the research data.
CHAPTER V

DATA ANALYSIS

Introduction

The purpose of this qualitative study is to examine the relationship between a male elementary classroom teacher and his principal, through the perceptions of administrators in PK – 5 schools in Cook County, Illinois, exclusive of the City of Chicago. The primary research question is what is the role that a principal has in the professional lives of male elementary classroom teachers?

Specifically, the fundamental research questions are:

1) What are administrators’ perceptions of the various stereotypes that men face as classroom teachers at the elementary level?

2) Given the challenges that men face who choose to teach at the elementary level, what does an administrator need to do to help these men maintain success and be effective in the classroom?

Chapter V is intended to analyze the data gathered from both the quantitative and qualitative analysis of responses to The Role of the Principal Questionnaire that was sent to 187 PK – 5 building principals in Cook County, Illinois, exclusive of the City of Chicago.

The researcher sent 187 qualitative questionnaires with explanatory cover letters to elementary principals in Cook County, Illinois, exclusive of the City of Chicago. Four
weeks after the initial mailing, the researcher sent another packet of qualitative questionnaires with explanatory cover letters to the same 187 schools in Cook County, Illinois, exclusive of the City of Chicago. Two weeks after the second mailing, the researcher sent 187 reminder post cards to complete and return the survey to a rented P.O. Box.

At the conclusion of this six-week period of time, 79 responses had been completed and returned, for a return percentage rate of 42%. For the purposes of this study, the results of 79 responses received will be displayed and analyzed. All figures and percentages come from the total (n = 79) respondents except when noted otherwise.

In the synthesis and analysis of this data, the researcher has tried to remain as objective as possible. In an effort to keep the researcher’s personal bias removed from this process, a personal journal was kept throughout the duration of this study. At the conclusion of the study, the journal was shredded.

The researcher’s finding will be presented in a way to address and answer the research questions posed above. Within this chapter, the participants’ answers will be synthesized and analyzed with the literature presented in Chapter II regarding Career Choice in Education, The Need for Male Role Models, The Ethic of Care in Education, The Role of the Principal, and Leadership. Finally, the researcher will present the implications suggested by this research study for principals with male elementary classroom teachers, in particular, as well as other avenues for potential educational research to explore further in light of this study.
What are Administrators’ Perceptions of the Various Stereotypes that Men Face as Classroom Teachers at the Elementary Level?

Before analyzing the perceptions that were reported in this study regarding male elementary teachers, it is significant to note that 94% (n = 74) of the principals believe that men are as effective instructionally in the elementary classroom as women. This number is especially important if one considers Bolman and Deal’s (2003) understanding that leadership “exists only in relationships and in the imagination and perception of the engaged parties” (p. 337). From those that took part in this study, it is clear that at least one of the engaged parties have a very favorable opinion of the other. Sergiovanni’s (1992) understanding of the heart of leadership “has to do with what a person believes, values, dreams about and is committed to…” (p. 7) and with so many principals reporting strong beliefs in the instructional capabilities of male elementary classroom teachers, the principals in this study are grounded in this reality. Considering that male elementary classroom teachers face a number of challenges to their success, at least from what was learned from the principals in this study, one of the challenges is not in the form of an administrator that believes they will fail in the classroom. Rather, the challenges are in the form of concerns about a male elementary teacher’s status, low salary, sexual orientation, and fear of pedophilia.

The principals that responded to this study are well in touch with the predicament of the male elementary classroom teacher. Despite being firm believers in the capabilities of male classroom teachers, the principals that responded know the landscape of the men in their buildings. Sixty-six percent (n = 53) of the principals that participated
reported an awareness of the various stereotypes related to male elementary classroom
teachers. While there were no questions regarding specific stereotypes, it is noteworthy
that nearly two-thirds of those principals that responded are aware of the fact that male
elementary classroom teachers face hurdles unique to their gender, in their profession,
especially at this level. One participant noted, “I think our culture generally makes the
assumption that women teach in elementary schools because they are more nurturing with
younger students.”

The significance of this awareness is grounded in Sergiovanni and Starratt’s
(2002) “professional virtue” which separates professionals from simply being competent.
One of the elements of this is a “Commitment not only to one’s own practice but to the
practice itself” (p. 58). Essentially, the principals in this study demonstrated their own
version of professional virtue, as they are aware of the specific concerns that face men
that choose to teach at the elementary level. These concerns being, low status, low
salary, questions regarding one’s sexual identity, and fear of pedophilia.

Not only are the principals in this study aware of the stereotypes that men face at
the elementary level, 62% (n = 49) acknowledge that there are particular challenges that
accompany those stereotypes. One principal in this study noted that he advises male
elementary school teachers, “Do not put yourself in one-on-one situations.” This reality
was thoroughly reviewed in Chapter II when considering the Career Choice in Education
that men make. Almost all the men in the relevant literature acknowledged the risks
associated with becoming a male elementary classroom teacher (Carrington, 2002;
Cushman, 2005; DeCorse & Vogtle, 1997; Wiest et al., 2003) and stipulate that the main
reason for doing so is to work with children out of a genuine love for children and the hope to impact their lives in some way. The fact that so many principals in this study have an understanding of the challenges that men face addresses another key element of Sergiovanni and Starratt’s (2002) “professional virtue:” the commitment to practice toward valued social ends. Applying this “virtue” to a principal means placing the principal at the service of his/her teachers, within the context of agreed upon school values, purposes and mission.

To this end, 41% (n = 33) of the principals that participated in this study indicated that there are different needs for male elementary teachers versus female elementary teachers. While this study was not specific in identifying those needs, this researcher argues that as a result of the concerns male elementary school teachers face that their female counterparts do not; the principals in this study recognize male elementary school teachers have different needs. Noting an awareness to the needs of teachers demonstrates a commitment to caring, a relevant portion of the review of relevant literature in Chapter II. Noddings (1984) argues that the profession of teaching includes moral and ethical caring relationships. She states further (1999) that “it is not possible to care adequately for people without responding to their needs and interests” (p. 12). What is critical at this point in the analysis is that the principals in this study have identified the male elementary teachers in their building have needs apart from their female colleagues.

Despite the awareness of the stereotypes that the principals in this study have reported, there is a significant lack of practical knowledge of this being manifested in their buildings. Eighty-five percent (n = 67) of the principals that took part in this study
do not know of men that have left teaching as a result of the stereotypes associated with male elementary classroom teachers. Seventy-seven percent (n = 61) of the principals reported that they do not receive more teacher concerns regarding male elementary classroom teachers over female classroom teachers, nor do they receive more concerns from parents (78% percent, n = 62) regarding male elementary classroom teachers over female classroom teachers. Sixty-seven percent (n = 53) of the principals reported that teachers in their buildings do not exhibit stereotypical behavior toward male elementary classroom teachers and only 38% (n = 30) reported they know of male elementary classroom teachers leaving to teach at another level.

This interesting lack of practicality in the data leads the researcher to consider Sergiovanni’s (1992) “head” of moral leadership, in which the practical application of the educational theories are combined with reflection. Specifically, Sergiovanni states, “Reflection, combined with personal vision and an internal system of values becomes the basis of leadership strategies and actions” (p. 7). The principals in this study indicate that there is an awareness of the challenges that male elementary classroom teachers face, yet the data reported in this study also indicates that very few of the principals have experienced a situation in which the known male stereotypes have directly impacted a teacher in their building.

If principals have identified that there are specific challenges that men face in the elementary classroom, and if there are specific needs that principals can identify for men, apart from their female colleagues, what does a principal do to support these men? This
will be explored further in the next section of analysis, as the second research question is addressed.

**Given the Challenges that Men Face Who Choose to Teach at the Elementary Level, What Does an Administrator Need to Do to Help These Men Maintain Success and be Effective in the Classroom?**

According to the principals in this study, meeting the individual needs of each and every teacher in his/her building is critical to success in the classroom. Forty-seven percent (n = 36) of the principals that participated in this study indicated that they meet the teachers’ needs, which goes a long way toward earning the trust of teachers. One of the respondents indicated, “[I] recognize staff for effective instruction and allow ample time for staff members to collaborate with and observe one another.” Youngs’ (2007) study addressed how critical the needs of first year teachers were, and the successful principals in that research thoughtfully identified mentors, observed often with feedback centered on student achievement and instruction, and provided opportunities for conversations between grade-level colleagues as well. While this researcher did not specifically ask how principals met the needs of his/her teachers, the fact that the principals in this study reported that they strive to attain this goal is noteworthy. Further, a principal striving to meet the needs of their teachers is exactly what teachers expect. Sergiovanni and Starratt (2002) argue that teachers believe their building principals “engage…at a level of moral discourse that mirrors the moral responsibility teachers model for their students” (p. 69).
Danielson’s (1996) framework gives principals the freedom to differentiate their supervision and evaluation and meet the needs of a variety of teachers, given what the principals observe in the classrooms. There is no one approach, there is no one pedagogy and there is no “right” answer that will be effective in every situation. Instead, Danielson is clear to point out “that even though good teachers may accomplish many of the same things, they do not achieve them in the same way” (p. 17). For principals to be effective in supporting male elementary classroom teachers, a framework like Danielson’s is critical to meeting this need.

Beyond the day-to-day needs of male classroom teachers, much of the relevant literature regarding males in elementary classrooms notes a drastic shortage when compared to the female counterparts (U.S. Bureau of Labor and Statistics, 2008). What is significant about the principals in this study is that sixty-one percent (n = 48) of them reported having at least one male classroom teacher in the building. The researcher was surprised that such a large number of the respondents did have male classroom teachers in the building. Most, if not all of the research surrounding Career Choice in Education points to the low numbers of men in elementary classroom positions.

To better understand the surprisingly high number in this study, one can consider the notion from Foster and Newman’s (2005) study that men approach their work in an elementary classroom, without regard to what other people think. To overcome “identity bruising,” one of the men in Foster and Newman’s study reported that they made the conscious decision to not “care what other people say” regarding his choice in profession (p. 347). Instead, the overwhelming research indicates that men choose to teach at the
elementary level because working with children is what they love to do and they wish to make a difference in the lives of their students (Carrington, 2002; Cushman, 2005; DeCorse & Vogtle, 1997; Wiest et al., 2003).

The principals in this study are well aware of the reasons why men choose not to enter their elementary classrooms. Seventy-six percent (n = 60) of them note that salary and low pay in some way contribute to the fact that men do not, and in some cases, cannot teach at the elementary level. This was discussed in Chapter II, specifically when noting Carrington’s (2002) study that reported more than two-thirds of the respondents indicated there were concerns about pay levels at this level of teaching. In addition, Cushman’s (2005) work points to salary and status as the reasons men choose not to teach at the elementary level.

That being said, the principals in this study point very quickly to the reality of an elementary school teacher’s salary. Note the following quotes from the open-ended responses:

- Money. Men have to take care of a family.
- Junior High and High School districts pay more and as primary breadwinners, this is a factor
- …Most want work where there are more extracurricular opportunities at junior high or high school
- More money at high school and middle school level – coaching stipends and other extra-curricular sponsorships
However, DeCorse and Vogtle (1997) view salary slightly differently, noting that the men in their study made a conscious decision to teach at the elementary level and knew what they were getting into in regards to salary. They argue that the teachers in their study, “may have developed a more mature outlook on the prospect of their life’s work,” and therefore will accept a lower salary (p. 41).

That being said, 17% (n = 13) of the principals in this study point to the lack of quality male applicants as the most consistent reason for not having any males as classroom teachers in their buildings. The following quotes from the open-ended portion of the questionnaire speak directly to this point:

- Up to this point, males have not been the best candidate for any particular position
- I do not now [have male teachers in the building] because male applicants didn’t interview as strongly to emerge as a premier hire
- We have not had an applicants for classroom positions
- Few quality applicants. Very few.

With such an overwhelming number of the principals in this study reporting confidence in men being as effective as women in the classroom (94%, n = 74), the researcher argues that if there were quality male applicants that presented themselves to these principals, they would be hired for classroom positions.

Given this situation, the researcher points to the methods of recruitment from Rebore (2004) as a way to potentially bridge this gap. One of the key concepts for Rebore in effective recruitment is the process itself, once the job vacancy is analyzed to
determine which recruiting strategy is most appropriate. Too often “many school
districts never evaluate their recruitment procedures” and instead rely on job success as
“the only true measure of how effective the recruitment process has been” (p. 97). From
the related literature and from the data in this study, the researcher argues that there are
quality male elementary classroom teachers, even if they are few in number. Perhaps a
more focused recruiting strategy, such as Rebore’s notion of contacting organizations that
promote the interests of minority groups would bring more male applicants to elementary
classroom positions. What can be argued from the data reported in this study is that
principals would hire a male for an elementary classroom position, if he was the top
candidate.

This is further illustrated when the responses to a hypothetical situation involving
“Mr. Smith, Kindergarten Teacher” are analyzed. Sixty percent (n = 46) of the
respondents indicated they would be supportive of the teacher, with the themes of those
responses detailed below.

*Mr. Smith is Well-Qualified*

Throughout the related literature regarding Career Choice in Education, at no
point does the argument surface that somehow men are not qualified to teach at the
elementary level. Not only does this notion fail to present itself, Skelton, Carrington,
Francis, Hutchings, Read, and Hall (2009) argue that more of a gender balance among
teachers might result in a more balanced education for children. Several of the principals
in this study indicated responses to hypothetical concerns regarding Mr. Smith as a
Kindergarten teacher:
• …Mr. Smith is a skilled and nurturing staff member that puts student needs at the center of his instructional planning

• …It is my responsibility to place teachers at positions to best meet the needs of the students

• Mr. Smith is qualified to educate your child. His credentials are excellent

• I wouldn’t hire him unless he was highly qualified

What is noteworthy is not only the idea that Mr. Smith is qualified for his position but the important responsibility the principals’ place on Mr. Smith meeting student needs inside the elementary classroom. Nias (1989) describes teaching in primary grades as an experience that requires teachers to not only care for but to love the children in their classrooms. King (1998) goes further when he argues, “care is requisite for, or synonymous with, primary grade teaching.” Within the context of a hypothetical situation surrounding a male kindergarten teacher, the principals in this study point to their own proficiency in hiring qualified candidates. Yet, there is a shortage of qualified male candidates to hire.

Gender is Not an Issue

The crux of this study is focused on the reality that men and women are perceived differently within the realm of education, specifically elementary education. Yet throughout the responses of the principals in this study, consistently appearing is this idea that gender is not an issue. In terms of personal qualities associated in a teacher, Cushman (2008) revealed what more than half of the principals that study were looking for; candidates who are: “fair and compassionate, approachable, able to form good
professional relationships, willingness to be involved” (p. 132). For the principals in this study, the following statements echo Cushman’s work that gender is not always a consideration:

- Give me academic concerns before gender concerns
- …Gender is not an issue, rather pedagogical skills that the teacher possesses
- Focus on skill and credentials, not gender
- Effective instruction is not gender related
- Best practice, regardless of gender
- Truly I do not look at gender but assessment

Even if the perceptions regarding a man’s Career Choice in Education include stepping down in status (DeCorse & Vogtle, 1997) and Foster and Newman’s (2005) “identity bruising,” the principals in this study seek to downplay the importance of gender when the issue is raised.

Importance of Male Role Models

The significance of male role models has often been used as a reason to recruit more men into elementary classrooms (Allan, 1994; Bryant & Zimmerman, 2003; Cushman, 2008). In this study, the principals used this reasoning to support having a male in their hypothetical kindergarten classroom. While there is some ambiguity in the literature of exactly what is hoped for in a “male role model,” the data from this study supports the fact that principals identified this as one of the ways that gender does make a difference. A sampling of the quotes from the open-ended portion of the questionnaire below supports this finding:
• …The students will have another male role model in their life
• Lack of male (African-American) role models in the community
• …All children need more male (and female) role models
• It is wonderful for students to have a male role model

There are specific qualities that African-Americans look for in terms of a role model, according to Bryant and Zimmerman (2003). Specifically, Bryant and Zimmerman argue that male role models “are key references…because they provide a window to the future, model positive behavior, and display adaptive techniques to which [one] can aspire to” (p. 37). In that study, those without male role models made poor choices in relation to substance use, delinquency, academic engagement, and psychological well-being. In Miller’s (2005) work, the male role model was an inspiration for a student of color to pursue a career in teaching.

There is no one-size-fits-all definition of what a male role model is and that has been detailed in Chapter II. The theme of male role models did have an interesting breakdown in regards to gender and race. Nine percent (n = 7) of the respondents noted the importance of male role models. Of this, 71% (n = 5) were White and 29% (n = 2) were Black/African-American. While one respondent did not identify his/her gender (n = 1), 43% (n = 3) were male, and 43% (n = 3) were female. It is interesting to note the racial gap in the data, even if the overall study numbers are low. Despite these numbers, what is significant is the fact that principals in this study do see positive male role models as an additional value to having male classroom teachers.
To summarize, respondents from this study believe that men are as effective instructionally in the classroom as women. The principals in this study have men teaching in their classrooms, are aware of the external challenges that men face when they choose to teach at this level, and do the best they can to meet the needs of the men in their building. From the data in this study, principals would hire a qualified male elementary classroom teacher if one were available. To help men maintain success and be effective in the classroom, the principals in this study point to the qualifications of the teacher explain that gender is not an issue, while simultaneously pointing to the importance of male role models.

**Limitations of the Study**

As a result of this study, the researcher intended to identify the role a principal plays in the professional life of male elementary classroom teachers through the perspectives of PK – 5 principals. Further investigation was undertaken to discover the perceptions that principals have regarding the stereotypes that male classroom teachers face, as well as what a principal does to ensure effectiveness and success in the classroom. This study found that principals are aware of the external challenges that men choosing to teach at the elementary level face and that an overwhelming number of these principals believe that men are instructionally as effective as women. To further support men at the elementary level, the principals in this study point out the qualifications of the male teachers indicate that gender is not an issue when it comes to teaching, and further the notion of positive male role models.
A possible limitation to this study was that the principals studied did not have any male classroom teachers in their building. It was possible that a respondent did not have any experience with the stereotypes that male teachers face. This may be a limitation in the sense that a respondent would not be able to report on perceptions that have not been formed. In this study, 10% (n = 8) of the principals reported having no male teachers in the building whatsoever. However, given the amount of related literature that exists for this study even the perceptions of principals that have not supervised male elementary classroom teachers makes a positive contribution to this study. Had there been a significant number of principals that responded without male classroom teachers, the researcher would have sent out another round of qualitative questionnaires to another county in Illinois, perhaps Lake County.

Another possible limitation to this study is the researcher’s biases toward the subject. The researcher was an elementary school teacher and is currently an administrator at the high school level. The researcher’s personal feelings toward the perceptions of male elementary classroom teachers and the perceptions of a building administrator are colored, both in positive and negative ways. To prevent the researcher’s own biases from entering into this study, the researcher kept a journal of thoughts, feelings, and reactions while pursuing this study. As a result, the researcher was able to process his feelings in the journal to keep his biases there and avoid them entering this study.

Another possible limitation to the study is that the data is limited to Cook County, Illinois, exclusive of the City of Chicago and is not to be generalized to other counties or
states. The results cannot be generalized to religious/parochial schools, schools that did not fit the sampling criteria, nor to schools that did not respond to the questionnaire.

Finally, a limitation to this study is the nature of survey research. A survey allows the researcher to obtain a number of responses at one given time. However, there is no opportunity for the researcher to have a face-to-face conversation with a principal that would not only clarify but also expand upon the data reported.

**Further Research**

The results of this study offer opportunities for further research. The next logical step would be to conduct interviews with PK – 5 principals in Cook County, Illinois, exclusive of the City of Chicago to go deeper into exploring the relationship between a male elementary classroom teacher and his building administrator. Follow-up interviews within the same search criteria could yield more detailed data regarding this relationship.

Additionally, the results of this study encourage future research to investigate what building principals specifically do to support the male elementary classroom teachers. The nature of this study was not detailed enough to delve into this realm, yet there is room for future research to explore the specifics in a more careful and methodical manner.

Also, the results of this study indicate that interviews with the principals of buildings that satisfied the site selection criteria for this study would be beneficial. There were a number of principals that did not respond to the call to participate in the research. An area to investigate is why those voices were silent in this research.
Finally, the voice of the male elementary classroom teacher is missing from this study, save for the related literature in Chapter II. Future research can study what male elementary classroom teachers have experienced, with regard to specific support, or lack thereof, from their building principals. Strengthening the voice of the male classroom teachers can shed further light on this relationship.

**Implications for Leadership Preparation**

The literature on the relationship between a building principal and a male elementary classroom teacher and the data obtained from this qualitative research study suggest that school districts must continue to find ways to bring males into the realm of elementary classroom teaching. Additionally, the literature and data presented in this study suggest that principal preparation programs need to provide aspiring principals with the tools to adequately differentiate their supervision and evaluation of the teachers in their building, and model leadership that mirrors best practice. Since it is understood that leadership is not something that is tangible (Bolman & Deal, 2003; Morgan, 1998; Sergiovanni, 1992) and that it “exists only in relationships and in the imagination and the perception of the engaged parties” (Bolman & Deal, 2003, p. 337), aspiring principals must rise to meet the demands of all the potential relationships and engaged parties in their buildings.

The principals in this study believe that men are as effective as women in the classroom and are looking for men to fill elementary teaching positions. Unfortunately, there simply is not a large pool of qualified male applicants that are approaching these principals with a desire to teach. What the data suggests is that when faced with a
hypothetical situation regarding a male kindergarten teacher, the principals rise to the defense of the classroom teacher. The principals use their own proficiency in hiring qualified applicants as one of their key points in defense of a male kindergarten teacher.

Targeted and strategic recruitment is critical to filling this need. Rebore (2004) notes that before one begins to recruit, one analyzes the vacancy to determine the most effective method for hiring. If principals are serious about bringing more male elementary classroom teachers into their buildings, principal preparation programs must demonstrate a proficiency in such analysis, recruitment and hiring. There are organizations like www.menteach.org that are committed to promoting male classroom teachers, especially at the elementary level. If this is an identified need in a school building, there are resources available to assist principals in filling these needs.

Perhaps to take it one step further, education leadership preparation programs can consider how to effectively counsel teachers considering high school jobs for the traditional reasons. The number of principals in this study that believe men are as effective instructionally as women is significant. Education leadership preparation programs need to capitalize on this belief and educate principals on how to bring effective teachers that are already in schools at the secondary level to the elementary level.

School districts need to also consider the significance, importance, and time necessary to provide quality, differentiated professional development to meet the needs of individual classroom teachers. The principals in this study understand the dilemma that male teachers face from the stereotypes to low salary and status. Providing principals
with the ability to meet the professional needs of their teachers will not erase the stigma that the male teachers at the elementary level experience. However, it will ensure that one of the commitments of “professional virtue,” espoused by Sergiovanni and Starratt (2002), to practice in an exemplary way, can continue to be met. As principals are able to provide individualized professional development, individualized feedback and evaluation, they are then able to point to student achievement and the unquestionable qualifications of their teachers regardless of gender.

The principals in this study highlighted what is stated in the literature regarding how critical trust is to the principal/teacher relationship. Without that sense of trust, Sergiovanni and Starratt (2002) argue that teachers lose their sense of commitment and this leads to alienation and feelings of resentment toward the administrator. When given a hypothetical situation in which a parent was challenging a teacher based on his gender, the principals in this study demonstrated a trust in the abilities of the teacher. If school districts are able to bring more well-qualified men into the elementary classrooms, such a sense of trust will only serve to bolster the sense of belonging to a school community and hopefully minimize some of the external factors that men face at this level of education. Courses in principal preparation programs must emphasize a consistent standard with which to evaluate teacher performance.

The principals in this study believe that men can be effective in the classroom and they are aware of the external pressures that men face at the elementary level. If concerns arise, the principals support their male teacher by noting how well credentialed he is, deflecting the attention away from the teacher’s gender, and affirming the
importance of male role models. In addition, the principals in this study point out the positive student outcomes from classrooms with male elementary classroom teachers.

A visitor walks into an elementary school, signs in on the visitor’s log, and asks to visit the first grade classroom. When shown to the classroom, the visitor is surprised to see a man in the front of the classroom teaching. The visitor asks if this man is the substitute and when told “No,” asks if there were no other “real” first grade teachers available when hiring. When told that this is a “real” first grade teacher, the visitor looks surprised.

In response, the principal tells the visitor how well vetted this applicant was, how sterling his credentials are, and how his appetite for professional development is insatiable. The principal goes on further to point out how student-centered his current lesson is, how this man pores over data from national and anecdotal sources, how much his students love coming to school, and how happy the parents from this classroom are. Finally, the principal shows the visitor the data from the most recent assessments, demonstrating excellent student outcomes.

This researcher suggests that for this scenario to bear out, more coursework must be included to educate principals on how to evaluate and assess teachers’ professional development needs. Furthermore, school districts might strongly reconsider the amount of time that is allotted in the current professional development model for principals to meet teachers’ professional needs, as the one-size-fits-all approach fails principals’ relationships with teachers, in the same way a one-size-fits-all approach fails teachers’ relationships with students.
Conclusions

The principals in this study recognize that male elementary classroom teachers face certain stereotypes when they choose to teach at this level. While many of the principals in this study have not had any first-hand experience of these stereotypes negatively impacting teachers in their buildings, nonetheless, the principals are aware of how challenging this line of work can be for men. Despite this lack of male gender stereotype “experience,” the principals in this study reported that they do strive to meet the needs of all their teachers regardless of gender.

In this study, the principals reported that they work to address the individual needs of all their teachers, including their male teachers. In some cases, this meant deflecting attention away from the fact that the teacher was a male, noting the benefits of having male role models in the classroom, and highlighting the qualifications and credentials of the male classroom teacher.

Educational leadership would be well-served to be more candid and deliberate about strengthening the relationships between all teachers and their administrators, but particularly between male elementary classroom teachers and their direct supervisors. The data from this study indicates that the principals believe men to be as effective instructionally in the classroom as women and yet elementary classrooms are lacking male classroom teachers. Careful planning and attention to these relationships opens the door to conversations between male teachers and their administrators. Such a conversation might lead a male eighth grade teacher to consider teaching at the fifth
grade level. Even further, such a conversation could lead a male fifth grade teacher to consider teaching kindergarten.

As educational leadership continues to monitor the principal-teacher relationship, especially the one between male elementary classroom teachers and their principals, the data from this study will serve as a starting point to look further at how principals can better serve a small (but hopefully growing) population of committed educators. Through continued awareness, individualized professional development, and defending how effective men are in the classroom, principals can continue to support those men that choose to teach at the elementary level.
APPENDIX A

THE ROLE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age?</th>
<th>What is your gender?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How many years did you teach prior to your first administrative position? _____
How many years did you teach at the PK – 5 level? _____
How many years have you been in administration? _____
How many years at the elementary level? _____
Have you been an administrator at another level? _____
How many teachers are in your building? _____
How many of those teachers are male? _____
How many of those male teachers are classroom teachers? _____

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of the various stereotypes regarding male elementary teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have teachers in the building who have expressed stereotypical thinking regarding male elementary teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know of men who have left teaching because of the stereotypes regarding elementary teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know of men who have left teaching at the elementary level and have continued teaching at another level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of the challenges that face men in particular at the elementary level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I receive more teacher concerns about male classroom teachers at the elementary level than about the female classroom teachers at the elementary level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, I receive more parent concerns about male classroom teachers at the elementary level than about the female classroom teachers at the elementary level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that the needs of male elementary teachers are different than the needs of female elementary teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am supportive of male teachers hugging their students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am supportive of female teachers hugging their students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men are as effective instructionally in the classroom as women.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please identify your race by placing an “X” in the appropriate box below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black, African American</th>
<th>American Indian or Alaska Native</th>
<th>Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>Native Hawaiian</td>
<td>Guamanian or Chamorro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>Hispanic, Latino,</td>
<td>Mexican, Mexican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cuban</td>
<td>Spanish origin</td>
<td>American, Chicano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. How do you address and/or respond to the different needs of female and male elementary teachers in your building?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

2. If you have not had a male teacher in your building, what has led to this circumstance?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

3. How would you respond to a parent concerned with the fact that “Mr. Smith” was a male kindergarten teacher?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

4. Given the challenges that men may face in the classroom, what do you do to promote effective instruction?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

5. Why do you think there is a shortage of male teachers in elementary classrooms? (Current statistics from the Center for Evaluation & Education Policy place the percentage of men in elementary classrooms at 10%; other non-profits cite a lower percentage)

________________________________________________________________________
Dear Principal,

As a doctoral candidate at Loyola University Chicago, I am conducting research for my dissertation entitled *The Role of the Principal in the Professional Life of Male Elementary Classroom Teachers*. The purpose of this study is to determine what impact, if any, an administrator has in the professional life of a male elementary school teacher.

Your voluntary participation will provide an opportunity for your voice to be added to the discussion of other principals determining what role principals have in male elementary classroom teachers’ lives.

The enclosed Questionnaire, *The Role of the Administrator* is intended to provide data that will help me better understand the relationship between a male elementary classroom teacher and his principal.

There may be a direct benefit to you from participation, if you currently have at least one male elementary classroom teacher. This research could shed some light on the experience of the male elementary classroom teachers in your building and might indicate what role, if any, you play in his professional life. However, if you do not have men currently in your building teaching, it is the hope of the researcher that this dissertation will contribute to the research that already exists about the shortage of men in elementary classrooms.

I would ask that you complete the enclosed Questionnaire, *The Role of the Administrator*, place it in the self-addressed stamped envelope provided, and mail it back to me by __________. If you do not wish to participate, you need not respond.

If you have any questions about this study, please feel welcome to contact me at 802-862-6521. You may also contact Dr. Marla Israel, my dissertation director at Loyola University at 312-915-6336 if you have any questions or concerns about the validity of this study. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, please feel welcome to contact the Loyola University Compliance Manager at 773-508-2629.

Thank you in advance for your participation in this study.

Gratefully,

Brian G. Ricca
Doctoral Candidate, Loyola University Chicago
APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER 2
Dear Principal,

As a doctoral candidate at Loyola University Chicago, I am conducting research for my dissertation entitled *The Role of the Principal in the Professional Life of Male Elementary Classroom Teachers*. The purpose of this study is to determine what impact, if any, an administrator has in the professional life of a male elementary school teacher.

If you have already completed this study, my sincere thanks; please disregard this mailing. If not, I would ask that you complete the enclosed Questionnaire, *The Role of the Administrator*, place it in the self-addressed stamped envelope provided, and mail it back to me by __________. If you do not wish to participate, you need not respond.

Your voluntary participation will provide an opportunity for your voice to be added to the discussion of other principals determining what role principals have in male elementary classroom teachers’ lives.

The enclosed Questionnaire, *The Role of the Administrator* is intended to provide data that will help me better understand the relationship between a male elementary classroom teacher and his principal.

There may be a direct benefit to you from participation, if you currently have at least one male elementary classroom teacher. This research could shed some light on the experience of the male elementary classroom teachers in your building and might indicate what role, if any, you play in his professional life. However, if you do not have men currently in your building teaching, it is the hope of the researcher that this dissertation will contribute to the research that already exists about the shortage of men in elementary classrooms.

If you have any questions about this study, please feel welcome to contact me at 802-862-6521. You may also contact Dr. Marla Israel, my dissertation director at Loyola University at 312-915-6336 if you have any questions or concerns about the validity of this study. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, please feel welcome to contact the Loyola University Compliance Manager at 773-508-2629.

Thank you in advance for your participation in this study.

Gratefully,

Brian G. Ricca
Doctoral Candidate, Loyola University Chicago
APPENDIX D

REMINDER POST CARD
As a doctoral candidate at **Loyola University Chicago**, I am conducting research for my dissertation entitled, *The Role of the Principal in the Professional Life of Male Elementary Classroom Teachers*. The purpose of my study is to identify what impact, if any, an administrator has in the life of a male elementary classroom teacher.

If you have already completed and returned the Questionnaire, The Role of the Administrator, that was mailed to you, thank you. **If not, please complete the Questionnaire and return in the stamped envelope that was provided.**

Sincerely,

Brian G. Ricca
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