

Occasional Papers

Representation of Women in School Leadership Positions in India

N. Mythili



National University of Educational Planning and Administration

17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi-110016, INDIA

2017

Representation of Women in School Leadership Positions in India

N. Mythili



National University of Educational Planning and Administration

17-B, Sri Aurobindo Marg, New Delhi - 110016

July 2017

CONTENTS

1.	School Leadership of Women in the Context of Developing Countries	2
2.	Theoretical Underpinnings for the Study	5
3.	Methodology	6
4.	Analysis and Discussion of Results	11
5.	Emerging Pattern from the State Wise Analysis of Representation of Women	15
6.	Interpretation of Results	18
7.	Conclusions and Policy Implications	21
8.	References	43

Representation of Women in School Leadership Positions in India

N. Mythili*

Abstract

Studies on the representation of women in school leadership positions are not new. But, it remains unexplored in Indian context. The present study attempts to fill this gap using all India and state level analysis of secondary data for all school categories. Results show that women are under-represented in three of the four school leadership positions in all school categories except in Primary to Higher Secondary schools. Women as vice principals are represented higher in 20 states constituting 64 percent of total vice-principals. A state level aggregate analysis shows that Kerala, Goa, Meghalaya and Delhi, show higher representation of women as designated HMs, vice principals and principals. They are followed by Daman & Diu, Karnataka, Gujarat, Chandigarh, Punjab and Tamil Nadu. Positioning the results within the discourses of opportunities, identity and privilege, it is theorized that representation of women in school leadership positions is a function of school leadership position assigned, school category and context. The policy implication for the study analyses the larger context of the education system within which school leadership of women is located. It is extremely crucial to reduce the confusion arising out of large number of dysfunctional stand-alone school categories mostly with acting-HMs. Larger schools with Primary level must be retained having sanctioned school leadership posts and all vacancies filled to achieve gender equity.

* Assistant Professor, National Centre for School Leadership, National University of Educational Planning and Administration, New Delhi – 110016. Email: sastry.mythili18@gmail.com

The author would like to thank the anonymous referee of the NUEPA Occasional Paper series for their suggestions to revise the paper.

1. School Leadership of Women in the Context of Developing Countries

Ever since 1970s, school leadership is studied with great interest. Research on women school leaders is no less explored since then (Shekshaft, 1987; Gorgan, 1996; Limerick and Lingard, 1995; Ozga, 1993). Issues reopen from time to time due to changing economic, social and political situations. Regardless of the widespread debates, study and activism, teaching is not a feminized profession in many developing countries. In Tanzania, 12.7 percent of secondary school principals are women; 8 percent of secondary school principals in Vannatu were women; in Soloman Islands and Papua New Guinea, only 2.9 percent of secondary school principals were women (Jane, et.al., 2010). Even though 75 percent of teachers are women, only 28 percent of elementary school principals are women and 14 percent of high school principals are women in Arab (Arar, 2010). Women make up the majority of the degree recipients in educational leadership, but hardly any ascend to leadership positions (Martin, 2011).

Studies¹ indicate that social, religious and cultural orthodox stereotypes in the larger societal context influence the representation of women in the education system in the form of family constraints, violence, career break due to child care responsibilities, sexual orientation, gender, identity and culture, gender discrimination, notion around the ethics of care, passive racism and marginalization of ethnic minority. Inequality of opportunity, lack of leadership preparation and negative perception about accepting the leadership position of a woman in the work place also impacts the representation of women in school leadership positions².

The monoculture of power (Blackmore, 1999) causes overt and covert practices on the career of women (Woods, 2005). Some overt practices are: promotion of men as

¹ Kruger, 1996; Mc Lay and Brown, 1999; Addi Raccach and Ayalin, 2002; Addi Raccach, 2002; Cubillo and Brown, 2003; Coleman, 2003; Fritzgerald, 2003; Arar, 2010; Trinidad and Normore, 2005; Mutopa and Shumba, 2006; Weyer, et.al, 2007; Mwebi, 2008; Chabaya, 2009; Lugg and Tooms, 2010; Jane, et.al, 2010; Gaus, 2011; Aslanargun, 2012; Brinia, 2012; Panigrahi, 2013; Miller, 2013; Kyriakoussis and Saathi (n.d.); Kyriakoussis and Saathi et.al (n.d.); *Sperandio and Kagoda (n.d.)*; National College of School Leadership, UK. n.d.

² Bass, 1981; Shekshaft, 1987; Dorsey, 1989; Chase, 1995; Limerick and Lingard, 1995; Blackmore, 1995&1999; Ozga, 1993; Coleman, 2003; Preciurumantuntu et.al., 2012; Gewirtz, et.al, 1995; Benham, 1997; Bolam, 1999; Lugg & Tooms, 2010; Martin, 2011; Smith, 2011; Abu-Tineh, 2012; Popescu and Gunter, 2011; Makura, n.d; Jane, et.al, 2010.

secondary school heads and women as primary school heads only to fulfill the requirement of affirmative action (Marshall, 1985) and; non-recognition and mis-recognition of achievements of women leaders (Fuller, 2013). Covert practices include a compulsion for women to maintain a male persona while practicing female community building skills, lack of formal and informal networks (Martin, 2011); discouragement for women to apply for university education which is a pre-requisite for principal's post in Bangladesh (Sperandio, 2011) and; glass ceiling and glass wall effects in Israel for those who develop Arab schools (Shipra, et.al., 2011; Metz and Neely, 1998).

Cubillo and Brown (2003) in their review of studies, suggest three models to study the reasons for under-representation of women in school leadership positions, *namely*, deficit model, internal barriers model, and culture and traditions. In the deficit model, women are seen to be trained and educated up to the level of men rather than be valued for what they might bring into the field. The internal barriers theory implies the perception that women lack confidence, competitiveness and have the fear of failure, which are due to the historical dominance of men over women. They also argue that unfamiliarity with the territory rather than lack of confidence results in lack of knowledge about 'rule of the game' that rise the initial fear. The virtual exclusion of women from the male dominated world of educational management for long is attributed to this cause.

The culture and traditions affect the ways in which women leaders operate at macro, meso and micro levels. First, the socio-political macro level refers to the hegemonic traditions and cultures that often strongly influenced by religious customs, beliefs and norms in which women are obliged to accept positioned by circumstances. At the meso level, power-relations within organizations, in particular, the hierarchical paternalistic nature of most educational institutions affects the representation of women, even if they allow as they bind the women to practice the traditional familial roles of caring and concern with the staff welfare, as aunts, as senior, single women with senior status but with little powers, or as daughters who are allowed some privileges. At the micro level, concerning the individual herself, women's perceived lack of self esteem, a

consequence of traditional male hegemony at the macro level, patriarchal culture, and climate at the meso level and dutiful compliance to socialization and societal norms (*ibid*).

In Indian context, the macro level constraints are drawn by reviewing the studies conducted in this area. According to Ramachandran (2008), formal education alone is not adequate to empower women and neutralize the accumulated distortions of the past. The content of education and context in which it is imparted and the ‘intangible’ inputs are also equally important (*ibid*). Despite recognizing the importance of school leadership while addressing systemic constraints for school leadership (Govinda, 2002; NUEPA, 2010; GOI and Planning Commission-12th Five Year plan, 2013) and few research studies on effective schools referring to the importance of school heads (Sujatha, 2011; European Union, et.al., 2011) also overlook the critical role of women, gender differences as well as gender equity in school leadership.

At the meso and micro levels, the culture and traditions affecting the leadership of women are deeply rooted in the practices situated at the macro level culture and traditions. Women are considered as aptly suited to teaching profession that provides an additional source of income for the family without disturbing patriarchy (Jandhyala *et.al*, 2014; Jandhyala and Ramachandran, 2015). Women are constrained by social class, norms and family mores about the choice of jobs (Banerjee, 2002) especially affecting the income of women who are from lower income families (Shenoy-Packer, 2014, p. 63).

Notwithstanding the sudden upsurge and thrust on school leadership development in India, leadership of women as a special focus area of research and development remains largely unexplored till date. The present study attempts to fill this gap by making a beginning in this direction. It focuses on the issue of representation of women in school leadership positions in Indian context by raising the question: *To what extent women are represented in different school leadership positions within the hierarchy of school categories in India?*

2. Theoretical Underpinnings for the Study

A few conceptual underpinnings identified in the electoral-race in the Indian context serves to understand the pertinent issues related to school leadership of women, thus, substituting for the lack of conceptual constructs in Indian context. These refer to women's attitude influencing their representation: women want to be leaders and that there is no significant difference in the aspirations of women who have children and those who do not; the economic development does not beget female leadership; women's broadening career paths have not led to a proportional increase in female leaders; further, women begin to aspire leadership position only if they see other women filling similar positions; an aversion to competition or preference for non-competitive environments may limit the women from occupying leadership positions. (Pande and Ford, 2011 p. 4). Against the backdrop of the above concepts, theoretical framework for understanding the representation of women in school leadership positions is adopted for the present study.

Three sets of discourses are identified for deriving the plausible reasons for differential representation of women in various school leadership positions. They are: discourses of Opportunity, Privilege, and Identity (Fitzgerald, 2003). The *discourse of opportunity* refers to the achievement of women in acquiring and exercising leadership roles largely influenced by personal, professional and systemic strategies. The *discourse of the privilege* implies the majority of women who succeed in the mostly male dominated cultures such as schools have achieved a level of status and privilege. The *discourse of identity* discusses the difference, diversity, and ethnic groups. In Indian context, discourse on identity also encompasses making a choice between different alternatives available amongst parallel leadership positions in the same cadre in the education system (*ibid*).

3. Methodology

The study was carried out at all India and state levels using the secondary data from UDISE for the year 2012-13. According to the data, as high as ten school categories with or without regular vacancies in the leadership positions as well as

designated school heads are in India. It was also found that the school leadership position is hierarchical in nature depending on the school category. As the pattern of school education is not uniform in all states, an iterative process was adopted to clean the data. It led to an understanding that representation of women is not just a comparison with men in leadership positions but depends on other systemic factors. This resulted in developing a distinct methodology to study the representation of women in school leadership positions. A brief description is presented herewith.

Step 1: Understanding Field Realities and Matching Secondary Data

Most of the Primary schools (I-V standards) do not carry the post of designated-Head Mistress (D-HM). They are managed by in-charge or acting Head Mistriess (A-HMs). Designated HM's position is usually found in secondary schools (I/VI-X standards) and sometimes in very large sized elementary schools (I-VIII standards). Vice Principals (VP) and Principals' (P) position are meant for schools having senior secondary schools (I/VI/IX to XII standards). The U-DISE data shows that there is more than one school head in large schools in which elementary, secondary and/or senior secondary schools are functioning together. Therefore, separating the school categories and matching with school head positions having decision making power constituted the first step. For example, if the principal is the head of a senior secondary school having 1 to 12 standards, there will be in-charge Head Mistress/Master (HM) at secondary and primary levels working under the Principal. This helped to address the issue of overlap and/or double counting of school heads observed in the secondary data. It resulted in significant cleaning of the data.

Step 2: Representation of different School Categories in India

There are 10 school categories (refer Table 1), out of which, nearly 57 percent are P-Only schools; 17.99 percent are P+UP schools and; 9.8 percent are UP-Only schools. Even though the representation of UP+S+HS and P+UP+S+HS school categories is as low as 3.82 percent and 2.29 percent, respectively, they have been considered for the study because of two reasons. First, they are large-sized school categories starting from primary/upper primary upto senior secondary level. Second,

they have designated school leadership position of vice principal and principal mostly with regular appointments. Categories such as HS-Only, S+HS, S-Only and UP-Only and HS-Only are stand-alone schools, mostly without a regular position of a designated school head. Hence, these schools are not considered for analysis.

Table 1: Representation of School Categories: All India (figures in percent)

School category*	Representation	Common names used	Considered/ Not Considered for the study
P only	56.93	Primary (1-5 standards)	Considered
P+UP	17.99	Elementary (1-8 standards)	
P+UP+S+HS	2.29	Higher secondary (1-12 standards)	
UP only	9.82	Upper primary (6-8 standards)	Not Considered
UP+S+ HS	3.82	Higher secondary (6 th to 12 th standards)	Considered
P+UP+S	2.12	Primary to Secondary (1 to 10 th standards)	
UP+S	2.43	Composite high or secondary school (6 th to 10 th standards)	
S only	2.55	Secondary or High School (9-10 standards)	Not Considered
S+HS	1.38	Higher secondary (9-12 standards)	
HS only	0.67	Higher Secondary (11-12 standards)	

(*Henceforth only standard forms will be used for school categories such as P+UP, P+UP+S, etc.).

Step 3: Representation of States in different School Categories

The U-DISE data shows all 35 states and Union Territories as having P-Only and P+UP school categories. 97 percent of states have PUP+S+HS, UP+S+HS and UP-Only schools (34 states). Except Tamil Nadu and Mizoram, all other states have P+UP+S schools (94.3 percent). UP+S school category is found in 80 percent of the states (28 states). UP+S schools are considered for analysis because they have designated school leadership position, essential for ensuring the universal access to schooling, opportunity for the completion of the entire school-stage up to 10th standard. A 75 percent cut-off is applied in considering a state with a particular school category

having a designated school head. The present study considers P-Only, P+UP, UP+S, P+UP+S, P+UP+S+HS and UP+S+HS school categories (Table 2).

Table 2: Representation of States in different School Categories in India

School Category	No. of states	Percentage	States without School Category
P only	35	100.0	
P+UP	35	100.0	
P+UP+S+HS	34	97.1	Mizoram
UP only	34	97.1	Chandigarh
UP+S+ HS	34	97.1	Mizoram
P+UP+S	33	94.3	Mizoram and Tamil Nadu
UP+S	28	80.0	A&N Islands, Chandigarh, Dadar & Nagar Haveli, Lakshadweep, Mizoram, Sikkim and Tamil Nadu
S only	26	74.3	West Bengal, Tripura, Sikkim, Rajasthan, Puducherry, Delhi, Arunachal Pradesh, Chandigarh, Lakshadweep
S+HS	25	71.43	West Bengal, Tripura, Sikkim, Odisha, Nagaland, Mizoram, Goa, Chandigarh, Andhra Pradesh, Delhi
HS only	23	65.7	West Bengal, Uttarakhand, Uttar Pradesh, Tripura, Sikkim, Rajasthan, Odisha, Madhya Pradesh, Lakshadweep, Delhi, Chandigarh, Arunachal Pradesh

States not considered against different leadership positions in different school categories are summarized in Table 3. Reasons for not considering are either due to the absence of data or near absence of a school category in that particular state or both.

Table 3: States Not Considered for Studying the Representation of Women in School Leadership Positions

School Category	Acting HMs *	Designated HMs	Vice Principals	Principals
P only	Delhi (34)			
P+UP	Delhi (34)	Delhi (34)		
P+UP+S+HS	Delhi, Mizoram (33)		A& N Islands, Mizoram (33)	Mizoram (34)
UP only	Chandigarh, Delhi (33)			
UP+S+ HS	Delhi Mizoram (33)		Mizoram (34)	Mizoram(34)
P+UP+S	Delhi, Mizoram Tamil Nadu (32)	Mizoram and Tamil Nadu (34)		
UP+S	A&N Islands, Sikkim, Chandigarh, Dadar and Nagar Haveli, Delhi Lakshadweep, Mizoram, Tamil Nadu (27)	A&N Islands, Sikkim, Chandigarh, Dadar and Nagar Haveli, Delhi, Lakshadweep, Mizoram, Tamil Nadu (27)		

(Numbers in the brackets represent the total number of states considered for the study). (*Hence forth, the acronym HM used in the text refers to Head Mistress).

In sum, representation of women in different school leadership positions in India depends on five major factors *viz.*, representation of school categories; positional hierarchy of school leadership such as acting HM, designated HM, vice principal or principal and; representation of men in school leadership positions.

Step 4: Matching School Leadership Position with School Categories

School Leadership position refers to the headship in a particular school category with a designation assigned by the departments of education in the respective states and UTs. Broadly, there are four types of school Leadership positions in India, *viz.*, acting HMs, designated HMs, vice principals, and principals. They are hierarchically arranged leadership positions matching with the hierarchy of school categories.

Acting HMs are those in the school leadership position where there is no designated Head or sanctioned post, or where the vacancy of a designated post is not yet filled through regular appointment. Usually a senior teacher is nominated as the acting

HM. Designated HM is a regular appointment meant for P+UP schools which are large sized, UP+S and P+UP+S schools. *Vice Principal and Principal* posts also refer to designated school leadership position in senior secondary schools such as P+UP+S+HS and UP+S+HS. Appointments for regular positions are made through an open selection process or promotion basis depending on the seniority and state's policy.

Step 5: Categorising into Under, Higher and Equal Representation of Women in school leadership position in the States

Analysis was carried out at national and state levels for all leadership positions, separately, using percentage analysis considering the appropriate school categories as discussed above. A comparison was made between the percentage of women and men school heads to understand the notion of representation.

A cut-off point at 50 percent is used to understand the nature of representation of women in school leadership positions as higher, equal and under-representation. The rationale for choosing the 50 percent mark is based on the following: Firstly, the principle of equality of opportunity is applied to study the representation of women, which is also followed in most of the studies reviewed and discussed above. Secondly, ensuring gender equality is a way of legitimising the unique contribution of women arising from their different life experiences, values and attitudes which are traditionally associated with feminine attributes while promoting the merit principle for improving quality of education (Paul, 2010). Thirdly, fair or substantive equality of opportunity not only gives scope for open competition but also fair access to qualification required for success. This addresses the issues of class, caste, sex, and social circumstances³. Fourth, Right to Equality is a first Fundamental Right listed in the Indian Constitution. Hence, it justifies to say that 50 percent be used as the cutoff point to make three distinct categories while studying the nature of representation of women vis-à-vis men's representation in the respective school leadership positions. Accordingly,

³ <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/equal-opportunity/> (accessed on 17th May 2017).

the representation of women below 50 percent in a particular school leadership position is called *Under Representation (UR)* of women school heads. A *representation of women above 50 percent* in a particular school leadership position is referred to as *Higher Representation (HR)* of women school heads. Lastly, an *exact representation of 50 percent of women* in the school leadership position is called *Equal Representation (ER)* of women school heads.

Similarly, a comparison between the representation of women teachers and men teachers is also made to study the extent of feminisation of the teaching profession in which these women are situated in different school leadership positions in India.

Further, in studying UR states, the first rank was given to the state with the lowest representation of women school heads in the leadership position considered for study. In case of HR states, the first rank was given to that state having the highest representation of women in the school leadership position which is being studied. No rank was assigned to ER states. A zero was assigned to that state where women teachers existed without any woman or man in the leadership position being studied. In other words, though they were retained in the study, no ranking was assigned to these states and was marked NA (Not Applicable). For example, NA was assigned in A & N Island because the data did not reveal any vice principal in that state.

4. Analysis and Discussion of Results

A detailed analysis of data was carried out at the national and state levels considering the school categories identified for the purpose. An aggregate analysis for all states was also carried out.

4.1 Representation of Women in School Leadership Positions: All India

At the all India level, women are under-represented than men do in most of the leadership positions and school categories except in P+UP+S+HS schools as vice principals. Women are also higher represented as acting HMs in P+UP+S+HS schools. There is an under representation of women as designated HMs at secondary level and as principals at senior secondary level in all the school categories. Results also show that

there is a higher representation of men teachers in all school categories when compared to women teachers except in P+UP+S+HS (see Appendix 2 for details). This is similar to the pattern observed in other developing countries where teaching profession is not yet feminized (see Table 4).

Table 4: Representation of Women in different School Leadership Positions and Women Teachers: All India

School Leadership Position	School Category (figures in percentages)						
	P only	P+UP	P+UP+S+HS	UP only	UP+HS	P+UP+S	UP+S
Women Acting HMs	34	34	52	24	35	36	26
Women Designated HMs		31				31	23
Women Vice Principals			64		46		
Women Principals			48		26		
Men Teachers	53	52	34	68	59	48	65
Women Teachers	47	48	66	32	41	52	35

4.2 State Level Aggregate Analysis of Women in School Leadership Positions

There is an under-representation of Women acting HMs in 67 percent of the total states (Refer Table 5). They are represented higher in 29 percent states and represented equally in 4 percent of the states. In 78 percent of the states, women are under-represented as designated HMs. In nearly 21 percent of states, women designated HMs are representation higher. Only one percent of states show equal representation of women as designated HMs. Women vice principals are under-represented in 50 percent of the states. They are equally represented in 6.1 percent of the states and in 43.9 percent of states, women vice principals are higher represented.

Table 5: Representation Pattern of States on Women in School Leadership Positions

	School Category	Percentage of States with representation of women in school leadership positions			All school categories together for All India		
		UR	ER	HR	UR	ER	HR
Acting HMs	Primary only P only	73.5(25)*	5.9 (2)	20.6 (7)	67.0	4.0	29.1
	Elementary P+UP	58.8 (20)	0.0 (0)	41.2 (4)			
	Primary with Higher secondary P+UP+S+HS	42.4 (14)	9.1 (3)	48.5(16)			
	Upper primary only UP only	69.7 (23)	6.1 (2)	24.2 (8)			
	Upper Primary with Higher Secondary UP+S+HS	84.8 (28)	3.0 (1)	12.1 (4)			
	Primary with secondary P+UP+S	60.6 (20)	3.0 (1)	36.4 (12)			
	Composite secondary UP+S	81.5 (22)	0.0 (0)	18.5 (5)			
Designated HMs	Elementary P+UP	74.3 (26)	0.0 (0)	25.7 (9)	78.1	1.0	20.8
	Primary with secondary P+UP+S	69.7 (23)	3.0 (1)	27.3 (9)			
	Composite secondary UP+S	92.9 (26)	0.0 (0)	7.1 (2)			
Vice Principals	Primary with Higher secondary P+UP+S+HS	33.3 (11)	6.1 (2)	60.6 (20)	50.0	6.1	43.9
	Upper Primary with Higher Secondary UP+S+HS	66.7 (22)	6.1 (2)	27.3 (9)			
Principals	Primary with Higher Secondary P+UP+S+HS	61.8 (21)	14.7 (5)	23.5 (8)	70.6	10.3	19.1
	Upper Primary with Higher Secondary UP+S+HS	79.4 (27)	5.9 (2)	14.7 (5)			

(* Figures in the brackets refer to the number of states; figures without brackets show percentage of states)

Similarly, there is under-representation of women principals in 70.6 percent of the states, equal representation in 10.3 percent states, and higher representation in 19.1 percent of the states. It is surprising to note that while there is a higher representation of women vice principals in 60.6 percent of the states in P+UP+S+HS school category, they are under-represented as principals in 62 percent of the states in the same school category. States with equal representation of women and men is highest (10.3 percent) for principals when compared to any other leadership position. By and large, more states show under-representation of women in leadership positions. A few states also show equal representation (Table 5).

4.3 State wise Analysis of Representation of Women in School Leadership Positions

In this section, a comprehensive summary of state wise analysis considering each school category is presented briefly. (see Appendix 1: Tables from 1 to 14 for more details).

Acting HMs: In most of the UR states, women A-HMs in all school categories are mostly found in the range of 20-29, 30-39 and 40-49 percent. In HR States, women acting HMs are found more in higher secondary and secondary school categories. There are no ER states.

Designated HMs: In P+UP schools, the representation of Women Designated HMs in UR states ranges between 11 (Lakshadweep) and 48 (Puducherry) percent. Most of them show 20-29 percent representation of women. Among HR States, in the same school category, 6 out of 9 states are in the range of 61-70 percent. In P+UP+S school category, twelve states are *under-represented*. Lakshadweep shows the lowest with zero percent. Puducherry shows the highest women HMs with 48 percent. Only in Dadar and Nagar Haveli men and women Designated HMs is equal in P+UP+S schools. Four out of nine states show higher representation of women designated HM in the range of 61-70 percent. In UP+S schools, only Kerala and Meghalaya show higher representation of women Designated HMs; Delhi ranks the lowest with none and Goa with 41 percent, the highest. Mostly, schools in Delhi are up to 12th standard, which is the reason why there is a low percentage of Designated HMs.

Vice Principals: Bihar, Rajasthan and Tripura have the highest under-representation of women vice principals with zero percent and Tamil Nadu has 48 percent under-representation (the highest) of women vice principals in UP+S+HS schools. Women vice principals are dispersed across all percentage ranges between 20-29 and 40-49 percent in UR states. In nine HR states in the same school category, there are more women vice principals. Also, all vice principals are women (100 percent) in UP+S+HS schools in Andhra Pradesh, Chandigarh, and Daman and Diu. Goa and Nagaland have equal representation of men and women in the same school category. In P+UP+S+HS schools, among HR states, Maharashtra ranks the lowest with 52 percent and Goa ranks

highest with 100 percent. Tripura and Meghalaya have equal representation of men and women as vice principals in the same school category. It is interesting to note that the number of UR states for women vice principals is lesser in P+UP+S+HS school category than that in UP+S+HS school category.

Principals: The percentage of women principals range from 4 to 43 percent in UR states in UP+S+HS school category. Here, UR states in 20-29 percentage range are more. Chandigarh and Sikkim are ER states in the same school category. HR states range from 53 percent in West Bengal (lowest) to 100 percent in Andhra Pradesh and Daman & Diu in UP+S+HS schools. In the P+UP+S+HS school category, Arunachal Pradesh has the highest under-representation of women principals with only nine percent and Jharkhand has 45 percent women principals among the UR states. There are more UR states in the range of 40-49 percent, which is an encouraging trend as representation of women seem to be on the rise. These states are: A & N Island, Daman & Diu, Goa, Karnataka and Tripura are ER states. Eight states show higher representation of women principals among HR states with Puducherry showing highest representation (88 percent) and Punjab with a lowest representation (56 percent) of women principals in P+UP+S+HS schools. Most of the states are in the range of 61-70 percent of higher representation of women as school principals.

5. Emerging Pattern from the State Wise Analysis of Representation of Women

State level analysis is further consolidated to identify the emerging pattern with regard to school leadership of women. Representation of women across all school categories are considered together to understand the emergent pattern for all four leadership positions. Using the state level results for every school leadership position, a 'y' is marked in the cells created for the purpose for each state either for UR, ER or HR as the case may be. All 'y's across all school categories marked for UR, ER and HR are added separately for each state and percentage is calculated. The percentages so obtained are used to identify the emerging pattern. The cutoff point at 50 percent is retained here also. In identifying the emerging pattern, states with equal to or more than 50% of school categories are considered under higher representation of women. ER

States are merged with HR states as their number is very less while identifying the pattern. (see Appendix 3: Tables 1 to 4).

In Chandigarh, Goa, Meghalaya, Punjab and Tamil Nadu, there is a higher representation of women school leaders in all 4 leadership positions. It implies that there is slightly a mix of higher representation women school heads between all three designated leadership positions and acting HMs' position. Even in Daman & Diu, Karnataka, Puducherry and Gujarat, the representation of women is higher in 3 leadership positions, such as vice principals, principals and Acting HMs. Andhra Pradesh and West Bengal also have a higher representation of vice principals and principals. In the remaining states, higher representation in one school leadership position is mostly limited to vice principals. Even here, it implies that there is a mix of higher representation of women school heads in two of the three designated leadership positions as well as acting-heads position. In contrast, Kerala and Delhi show higher representation of women school leaders only in regular leadership posts such as designated HM, vice principals and principals. It implies that there is definitely a higher representation of women in leadership positions (Table 6).

Table 6: Emerging Pattern of Women in different School Leadership Positions in States having Higher Representation

School Leadership Position	1 leadership Position	2 leadership positions	3 leadership Positions	4 leadership Positions
A-HMs	A & N Islands		Daman & Diu, Karnataka Pondicherry, Gujarat	Chandigarh Goa Meghalaya Punjab Tamil Nadu
D- HMs	Dadar & N Haveli		Daman & Diu, Delhi, Kerala	
Vice principals	Assam , Odisha, Haryana, Chhattisgarh, Himachal Pradesh, Nagaland, Jharkhand, Maharashtra	Andhra Pradesh West Bengal	Daman & Diu, Karnataka, Delhi, Kerala, Gujarat, Pondicherry	
Principals		Andhra Pradesh West Bengal	Delhi, Kerala, Gujarat, Pondicherry, Karnataka	

(States in **Bold and italics** show clearly that there is a higher representation of women in three designated leadership positions; states in **Bold** indicate higher representation in all the four leadership positions, a mix of designated and acting positions).

Goa shows that there is no under representation of women school leaders in any school category in addition to having equal representation of principals and vice principals. It clearly shows that there is a higher representation of Women in school leadership positions in Goa. Similarly, trajectory of representation of states across different leadership positions also shows that Kerala, Delhi, and Meghalaya have higher and./or equal representation of women as Designated HMs, vice principals and principals. It can be concluded that there is a higher representation of women in three school leadership positions such as designated HMs, vice principals and principals in Goa, Kerala, Delhi and Meghalaya (Table 7).

The above mentioned four states with higher representation of women school-heads are closely followed by Daman & Diu, Karnataka, Gujarat and Chandigarh as there is an *equal* representation of women in all four leadership positions. Even though Punjab and Tamil Nadu show higher representation of women in all 4 leadership positions, there is no equal representation of women in any of the leadership positions. In addition, a higher representation of Acting HMs observed in these states implies that regular vacancies for these leadership positions may not yet be fully filled. Because of this, these states can be considered to have moderate representation of women in the three designated leadership positions (Table 7).

Table 7: Emerging Pattern of Women in different School Leadership Positions in the States having Equal Representation

School Leadership Position	1 leadership Position	2 leadership positions	3 leadership Positions	4 leadership Positions
Acting HMs	Andhra Pradesh, Goa, Gujarat, Haryana, Odisha Maharashtra, Meghalaya	Dadar & N Haveli Chandigarh, Daman & Diu	Goa	Nil
Designated HMs		Dadar & N Haveli		
Vice Principal	Nagaland	Tripura	Goa	
Principal	Karnataka , Sikkim	Chandigarh, Daman & Diu, Tripura	Goa	

Remaining states such as Arunachal Pradesh, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Jammu & Kashmir, Lakshadweep, Madhya Pradesh, Manipur, Mizoram, Rajasthan, Sikkim, Tripura, Uttar Pradesh and Uttarakhand have under-representation of women in all school leadership positions.

6. Interpretation of Results

The results discussed so far on the representation of women school leaders are interpreted positioning within the three theoretical discourses of opportunity, identity and privilege (Fitzgerald, 2003).

The Discourse of Opportunities: Firstly, there is a high percentage of acting or in-charge positions instead of designated School Leadership Positions. Acting HMs are in 57 percent of P-Only schools as well as an additional 4.57 percent stand-alone schools in S-Only, HS-Only and S+HS-Only schools. Results show that only in 38 percent of schools, designated leadership positions with regular vacancies are present. Secondly, designated school leadership positions exist only in 4 out of 10 school categories constituting a mere 40 percent of school categories having just 32 percent of the total schools. These school categories are P+UP+S, P+UP+S+HS; UP+S+HS and UP+S. These two scenarios imply that opportunity available for school Leadership positions is acutely low. Within this abysmally low opportunity available for school leadership, women are represented higher as vice principals only in 2.9 percent schools belonging to P+UP+S+HS category. It can be concluded that there is a severe deficit of representation of women in school leadership positions in India.

It is also crucial to observe that each state has a predominant pattern of schooling. For example, in Karnataka, the predominant pattern of schooling is P-Only, P+UP, and P+UP+S schools. It may be possible that Karnataka has a higher representation of Women HMs in these school categories when compared to those in other school categories. In contrast, Uttar Pradesh has all types of school categories and women might have been spread in all these school leadership positions. This may be a reason for the under representation of women in Uttar Pradesh. In Mizoram, predominant school categories as per the UDISE data are HS-Only and S+HS, which are rarely seen in other states. In contrast, the popular school categories of other states such as P to HS and UP to HS are present scantily in Mizoram according to the data. So, the representation of women as vice principals and principals as lower may also be due to non-consideration of the predominant school categories in the state for analysis. In

Andhra Pradesh, the predominant school pattern is P-Only and UP+S schools. It is obvious that there are more designated HMs than the principals. These realities imply that the representation of women in different leadership positions not only depends on the number of women HMs in that school category, but also on the pattern of the school education system in that state that is based on the dominantly prevailing school categories for the state.

Discourse of Identity: In the system, parallel leadership positions exist at the district administration level, Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA) and Rashtiya Madhyamik Shiksha Abhiyan (RMSA) programmatic structures with that of school leadership positions such as designated HM, vice principals and principals. Those appointed as programme implementation officers in SSA and RMSA enjoy better decision making powers, autonomy and control mechanisms along with comparatively lesser accountability when compared to these school leaders. In some of the states, individuals have a choice to become a school head or educational administrators under the same cadre and service rules. For example, instead of working as designated HM at secondary school level, one can be in the leadership positions at Block level as Block resource persons and/or Block resource coordinators. Or, they can work as academic monitoring officers in SSA instead of head teacher at secondary level. It can also be a junior lecturer at higher secondary level instead of High School HM. Instead of school heads at secondary level, one can work as project officers in SSA and RMSA at the state level after five to seven years of experience. So, many states witness frequent internal transfers of school heads from school leadership positions to various system level leadership positions. Women designated HMs in India may prefer to negotiate this aspect to make choice at school or system level. They may choose the parallel leadership position which seems to be advantageous than the designated HM's post at secondary level. In contrast, principal and vice principal at higher secondary level enjoy better social status, greater autonomy and decision making powers in the system and hence prefer to remain in these positions than shifting to programmatic structures.

Discourse of the Privilege: Out of the three designated leadership positions existing in 32 percent of the schools, higher representation of women as vice principals is only in

2.29 percent schools in P+UP+S+HS category. Ascending to these positions is also influenced by their educational, social, familial and cultural contexts beyond the education system. Vice principals and principals is a position achieved by fulfilling the criteria of selection through competition, qualification and a proven record in the career besides seniority based promotion. The higher representation of women as vice principals indicate that women have also attempted to overcome the glass ceiling and glass wall effects contesting the popular notion that men manage from leadership positions and women teach.

In contrast, the under-representation of women as school leaders is due to socio-cultural traditions entrenched in the hegemony, patriarchy in the education system causes under-representation. It may also be due to non-acceptance of leadership of women by other women as well as men colleagues, hesitation on the part of the women to take risks as school leaders, lack of family support and other social compulsions, cultural context of the society where competitiveness is not encouraged or accepted and many other factors also limit the women from aspiring and seeking an identity as school leader. It is peculiar to India where women are seen as change agents and guardians of old cultures (Gosh, 1996). Because of all these reasons and many more, the representation of women depends on several contextual and educational factors in India.

The representation of Women in School leadership Position in Indian context is, therefore, defined as *those factors influencing each other in a comparative perspective in which women school leaders functioning in a given school category having a specific leadership position with their men counterparts*. Further, “Representation of women in school leadership [SL_R] is a function of representation of the school categories [SC] and school leadership positions assigned [SL_A] to that school category within the given context [C] of the system’s policy and existing practices, the proportion of men and women teachers and available opportunities and choices”.

It is expressed in the form of a simple equation: $SL_R = C [f(SC, SL_A)]$.

7. Conclusions and Policy Implications

A study of school leadership of women, though not new, remains untouched in Indian context. In the present paper, an attempt has been made to study the representation of women in four school leadership positions such as Acting HMs, Designated HMs, Vice Principals and Principals. Secondary data from UDISE (2012-13) is used to study all states and Union territories. Results indicate that women are under-represented in three of the four leadership positions. There is a higher representation of women as vice principals only in P+UP+S+HS school category. States such as Kerala, Delhi, Goa, and Meghalaya show clearly a higher representation of women as Designated HMs, vice principals and principals as well as equal representation. These are closely followed by Daman & Diu, Karnataka, and Gujarat and Chandigarh. Punjab and Tamil Nadu show moderate representation of women in three designated leadership positions. Remaining states have under representation of women heads in all four leadership positions. In short, feminization of school leadership is not a predominant feature in India.

Opportunity for school leadership positions exists in less than 40 percent of total schools in India. It is compounded by the challenge of parallel leadership positions at various levels in the education system. This might be the reason for the lower representation of women in leadership positions except as vice principals in P+UP+S+HS schools, a mere 2.9 percent of the total school categories.

Nearly 60 percent of school categories without designated leadership positions indicate the systemic dysfunction as the large proportion of these acting HMs can be rolled back anytime as teachers. Even when all three designated positions are filled with school heads with regular appointments, their proportion would still remain low at 32 percent of the total schools. It is not only the issue of women's representation, but the available *opportunity* within the system in terms of sanctioned posts, designated leadership positions and existing vacancies. The stand-alone school categories such as S-Only, HS-Only, UP-Only and S+HS mostly without the sanctioned posts for designated leadership positions calls for a wider debate in terms of their relevance and

contribution for achieving universal goals of education. Such a debate needs to address the confusion arising from a large number of school categories without designated leadership positions severely affecting the appointments of school heads. Within this larger systemic context, the representation of women's leadership needs to be positioned for a meaningful intervention to improve gender equity.

The policy suggestion would be to reduce the prevailing confusion by decreasing the number of school categories. It is viable to retain larger sized school category in which Primary school with 1-5 standards are compulsorily included such as P+UP, P+UP+S and P+UP+S+HS. It is also feasible to retain UP+S+HS schools across all states for which P-Only schools are already attached as feeder schools complying with the RTE norms for ensuring universal access to education. Six school categories, viz., P-Only, P+UP, P+UP+S, P+UP+S+HS, UP+S+HS and UP+S can be retained. Stand alone schools can be merged to these schools. Clearly defined leadership positions with sanctioned posts can be assigned to these six school categories as Junior HMs for P-Only and P+UP schools, secondary HMs for P+UP+S schools; Vice principals and Principals for P+UP+S+HS and UP+S+HS schools. All schools would then have regular appointments either on promotion basis, competition or a combination of both. An initiative of this nature contributes to redesigning a well managed school system in which all school categories have clearly defined school leadership positions. Within this larger context, the study of women leaders is more meaningful.

Appendix 1: Representation of Women in School Leadership Positions (U DISE: 2012-13)
(All figures in percentage except Ranking)
(Abbreviations: D-HMs = Designated HMs; VPs= Vice Principals; P= Principals; W = Women)

Table 1: Representation of Women Acting HMs in P only Schools					
S.No	States		W-AHMs	Rank	Women Teachers
1	Lakshadweep	Under Representation	0	1	45
2	Tripura		6	2	26
3	Assam		23	3	37
4	Andhra Pradesh		25	4	52
5	Nagaland		26	5	46
6	Odisha		29	6	43
7	Arunachal Pradesh		29	6	41
8	Chhattisgarh		29	6	37
9	Jharkhand		31	7	30
10	Madhya Pradesh		31	7	33
11	Mizoram		31	7	48
12	Rajasthan		31	7	33
13	Maharashtra		31	7	47
14	West Bengal		33	8	45
15	Uttar Pradesh		33	8	44
16	Haryana		34	9	46
17	Sikkim		34	9	49
18	Himachal Pradesh		35	10	45
19	Bihar		35	10	45
20	Manipur		37	11	48
21	Uttarakhand		40	12	56
22	Dadra & Nagar Haveli		41	13	59
23	Jammu & Kashmir		41	13	41
24	Daman & Diu		44	14	77
25	Karnataka		48	15	51
26	Gujarat	Equal	50	NO RANK	49
27	Chandigarh		50		87
28	Meghalaya	Higher Representation	56	5	56
29	Punjab		59	4	69
30	Puducherry		61	3	69
31	A & N Islands		71	2	68
32	Goa		82	1	89
33	Tamil Nadu		82	1	83
34	Kerala		82	1	82
35	Delhi			No Acting HM	

Table 2: Representation of Women Acting HMs in P+UP Schools					
S.No.	States		W-A HMs	Rank	Women Teachers
1	Tripura	Under Representation	7	1	24
2	Jharkhand		18	2	29
3	Bihar		21	3	37
4	Dadra & Nagar Haveli		24	4	58
5	Lakshadweep		25	5	50
6	Odisha		25	5	46
7	Rajasthan		26	6	33
8	West Bengal		29	7	44
9	Jammu & Kashmir		29	7	41
10	Arunachal Pradesh		29	7	42
11	Manipur		32	8	49
12	Uttar Pradesh		32	8	40
13	Nagaland		34	9	56
14	Maharashtra		35	10	48
15	Assam		37	11	41
16	Mizoram		38	12	55
17	Andhra Pradesh		38	13	49
18	Sikkim		41	14	54
19	Madhya Pradesh		43	15	55
20	Chhattisgarh		48	16	65
21	Gujarat	Higher Representation	51	13	54
22	Haryana		53	12	63
23	Uttarakhand		55	11	65
24	Goa		57	10	80
25	Himachal Pradesh		60	9	69
26	Karnataka		60	9	57
27	Puducherry		62	8	75
28	A & N Islands		64	7	61
29	Tamil Nadu		66	6	71
30	Daman & Diu		67	5	89
31	Punjab		79	4	85
32	Chandigarh		83	3	83
33	Kerala		85	2	76
34	Meghalaya		88	1	70
35	Delhi			No Acting HM	

Table 3: Representation of Women Acting HMs in UP only Schools					
Sl. No	States		W-AHMs	Rank	Women Teachers
1	Lakshadweep	Under Representation	0	1	31
2	Puducherry		0	1	4
3	Sikkim		0	1	23
4	Tripura		0	1	44
5	Nagaland		12	2	34
6	Bihar		14	3	31
7	Chhattisgarh		16	4	32
8	Mizoram		16	4	35
9	Assam		17	5	24
10	West Bengal		18	6	21
11	Odisha		20	7	31
12	Haryana		23	8	34
13	Uttar Pradesh		23	8	31
14	Himachal Pradesh		23	8	26
15	Arunachal Pradesh		25	9	51
16	Madhya Pradesh		26	10	31
17	Uttarakhand		28	11	38
18	Manipur		29	12	37
19	A & N Islands		30	13	40
20	Jharkhand		31	14	24
21	Goa		33	15	79
22	Meghalaya		40	16	46
23	Punjab		46	17	56
24	Andhra Pradesh	Equal	50	No Rank	13
25	Maharashtra		50		56
26	Gujarat	Higher Representation	57	6	57
27	Daman & Diu		57	6	49
28	Kerala		68	5	70
29	Karnataka		72	4	61
30	Rajasthan		73	3	75
31	Tamil Nadu		73	3	83
32	Jammu & Kashmir		92	2	84
33	Dadra & Nagar Haveli		100	1	100
34	Delhi	No Acting HM			
35	Chandigarh	No school category			

Table 4: Representation of Women Acting HMs in P+UP+S+HS Schools					
Sl. No	State		W- A HMs	Rank	Women Teachers
1	Lakshadweep	Under Representation	0	1	52
2	Mizoram		School category does not exist		
3	Bihar		6	2	18
4	Manipur		22	3	46
5	Tripura		25	4	38
6	Rajasthan		25	4	33
7	Arunachal Pradesh		29	5	34
8	Jharkhand		35	6	48
9	Nagaland		36	7	62
10	Uttar Pradesh		38	8	37
11	Jammu & Kashmir		39	9	57
12	Maharashtra		47	10	55
13	West Bengal		47	10	66
14	Odisha		49	11	67
15	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	Equal	50	No Rank	81
16	Goa		50		75
17	Meghalaya		50		73
18	A & N Islands	Higher Representation	51	15	60
19	Andhra Pradesh		52	14	59
20	Chhattisgarh		54	13	63
21	Uttarakhand		55	12	70
22	Madhya Pradesh		56	11	64
23	Haryana		58	10	63
24	Himachal Pradesh		59	9	68
25	Chandigarh		64	8	84
26	Gujarat		64	8	63
27	Punjab		69	7	81
28	Sikkim		71	6	53
29	Assam		75	5	49
30	Karnataka		76	4	79
31	Kerala		76	4	81
32	Tamil Nadu		77	15	83
33	Puducherry		81	14	75
34	Daman & Diu		100	13	86
35	Delhi	No Acting HM			

Table 5: Representation of Women Acting HMs in UP+S+HS Schools					
Sl.No	State		W-A HMs	Rank	Women Teachers
1	Arunachal Pradesh	Under Representation	0	1	25
2	Chandigarh		0	1	76
3	Dadra & Nagar Haveli		0	1	35
4	Goa		0	1	47
5	Lakshadweep		0	1	47
6	Manipur		0	1	45
7	Sikkim		0	1	58
8	Jammu & Kashmir		14	2	32
9	Uttar Pradesh		19	3	17
10	Uttarakhand		19	3	25
11	Assam		19	3	33
12	Bihar		20	4	27
13	West Bengal		21	5	37
14	Rajasthan		24	6	26
15	Tripura		25	7	29
16	Himachal Pradesh		26	8	37
17	Maharashtra		27	9	31
18	Gujarat		27	9	29
19	Punjab		32	10	58
20	Chhattisgarh		33	11	43
21	Nagaland		33	12	47
22	Madhya Pradesh		34	13	40
23	Jharkhand		35	14	45
24	Haryana		36	15	43
25	Andhra Pradesh		36	15	42
26	Karnataka		40	16	37
27	A & N Islands		42	17	46
28	Tamil Nadu		46	18	57
29	Odisha	Equal	50		37
30	Puducherry	Higher	63	4	51
31	Meghalaya		67	3	57
32	Kerala		72	2	71
33	Daman & Diu		75	1	43
34	Mizoram	No school category			
35	Delhi	No acting HMs			

Table 6: Representation of Women Acting HMs in P+UP+S Schools					
S.No	State		W-A HMs	Rank	Women Teachers
1	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	Under Representation	0	1	70
2	Lakshadweep		0	1	20
3	Mizoram		No school category	No rank	34
4	Tamil Nadu				0
5	Jharkhand		14	2	34
6	Tripura		16	3	28
7	Bihar		18	4	32
8	Rajasthan		18	4	28
9	West Bengal		20	5	43
10	Arunachal Pradesh		20	5	39
11	Manipur		23	6	47
12	Odisha		27	7	44
13	Uttar Pradesh		27	7	28
14	Andhra Pradesh		30	8	47
15	Sikkim		30	8	48
16	Jammu & Kashmir		38	9	51
17	Nagaland		38	9	54
18	Assam		38	9	51
19	Madhya Pradesh		45	10	54
20	Maharashtra		48	11	61
21	Daman & Diu	Equal	50	No rank	86
22	Gujarat	Higher Representation	54	11	65
23	A & N Islands		59	10	66
24	Meghalaya		60	9	76
25	Himachal Pradesh		61	8	66
26	Uttarakhand		65	7	64
27	Karnataka		66	6	73
28	Chhattisgarh		67	5	67
29	Puducherry		72	4	73
30	Punjab		73	3	85
31	Chandigarh		78	2	80
32	Kerala		78	2	83
33	Goa		85	1	82
34	Delhi		No Acting HM		

Table 7: Representation of Women Acting HMs in UP+S Schools					
S. No	State		W-A HMs	Rank	Women teachers
1	Chhattisgarh		0	1	38
2	Madhya Pradesh	Under Representation	13	2	46
3	Himachal Pradesh		13	2	32
4	Bihar		15	3	21
5	Rajasthan		16	4	20
6	Jammu & Kashmir		17	5	30
7	Odisha		17	5	26
8	Assam		19	6	33
9	Haryana		20	7	37
10	Uttarakhand		21	8	30
11	Uttar Pradesh		21	8	19
12	Jharkhand		23	9	33
13	Maharashtra		23	9	38
14	Gujarat		25	10	32
15	Puducherry		27	11	53
16	West Bengal		29	12	40
17	Nagaland		30	13	32
18	Andhra Pradesh		31	14	38
19	Manipur		32	15	51
20	Punjab		34	16	55
21	Meghalaya		36	16	52
22	Karnataka	44	17	38	
23	Goa	Higher	64	3	66
24	Kerala		70	2	75
25	Arunachal Pradesh		100	1	36
26	Daman & Diu		100	1	64
27	Tripura		100	1	50

Table 8: Representation of Women Designated HMs in P+UP+S Schools					
S. No	States		W-D HMs	Rank	Women teachers
1	Lakshadweep	Under Representation	0	1	20
2	Bihar		12	2	32
3	Arunachal Pradesh		12	2	39
4	Rajasthan		14	3	28
5	Manipur		16	4	47
6	Tripura		18	5	28
7	Assam		22	6	51
8	Sikkim		23	7	48
9	Nagaland		25	8	54
10	Odisha		25	8	44
11	Uttar Pradesh		26	9	28
12	Jharkhand		26	9	34
13	Haryana		32	10	60
14	Daman & Diu		33	11	68
15	West Bengal		34	12	43
16	Jammu & Kashmir		37	13	51
17	Madhya Pradesh		37	13	54
18	Himachal Pradesh		42	14	66
19	Andhra Pradesh		42	14	47
20	Maharashtra		43	15	61
21	Gujarat		45	16	65
22	Chhattisgarh		47	17	67
23	Puducherry		48	18	73
24	Dadar & Nagar Haveli	Equal	50	No rank	70
25	Uttarakhand	Higher Representation	55	9	64
26	Karnataka		57	8	73
27	Kerala		63	7	83
28	Punjab		65	6	85
29	Goa		68	5	82
30	Meghalaya		69	4	76
31	Chandigarh		71	3	80
32	A & N Islands		73	2	66
33	Delhi		81	1	83

Table 9: Representation of Women Designated HMs in UP+S Schools					
S. No	State		W-D HMs	Rank	Women teachers
1	Delhi	Under Representation	0	1	43
2	Rajasthan		9	2	20
3	Uttarakhand		12	3	30
4	Puducherry		16	4	53
5	Bihar		17	5	21
6	Uttar Pradesh		17	5	19
7	Chhattisgarh		18	6	38
8	Haryana		18	6	37
9	Assam		19	7	33
10	Odisha		19	7	26
11	Nagaland		21	8	32
12	Himachal Pradesh		22	9	32
13	West Bengal		25	10	40
14	Jharkhand		25	10	33
15	Maharashtra		26	11	38
16	Manipur		26	11	51
17	Gujarat		28	12	32
18	Jammu & Kashmir		28	12	30
19	Madhya Pradesh		29	13	46
20	Karnataka		30	14	38
21	Andhra Pradesh		31	15	38
22	Daman & Diu		33	16	64
23	Tripura		33	16	50
24	Arunachal Pradesh		39	17	38
25	Punjab		40	18	55
26	Goa		41	19	66
27	Meghalaya	Higher Representation	52	2	52
28	Kerala		71	1	75

Table 10: Representation of Women Designated HMs in P+UP Schools					
S. No	State		W-D HMs	Rank	women Teachers
1	Lakshadweep	Under Representation	11	1	50
2	Rajasthan		17	2	33
3	Arunachal Pradesh		18	3	42
4	Bihar		19	4	37
5	Assam		19	4	41
6	Tripura		20	5	24
7	Jharkhand		20	5	29
8	Manipur		22	6	49
9	West Bengal		23	7	44
10	Sikkim		23	7	54
11	Odisha		24	8	46
12	Mizoram		26	9	55
13	Nagaland		26	9	56
14	Gujarat		29	10	54
15	Uttar Pradesh		29	10	40
16	Jammu & Kashmir		29	10	41
17	Madhya Pradesh		32	11	55
18	Haryana		37	12	63
19	Karnataka		38	13	57
20	Maharashtra		39	14	48
21	Chhattisgarh		41	15	65
22	Andhra Pradesh		42	16	49
23	A & N Islands		45	17	61
24	Himachal Pradesh		46	18	69
25	Uttarakhand		47	19	65
26	Puducherry		48	20	75
27	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	Higher Representation	59	9	58
28	Kerala		60	8	76
29	Meghalaya		60	7	70
30	Tamil Nadu		62	6	71
31	Goa		63	5	80
32	Punjab		68	4	85
33	Chandigarh		73	3	83
34	Delhi		78	2	86
35	Daman & Diu		80	1	89

Table 11: Representation of Women Vice Principals in P+ UP+S +HS Schools					
S. No	STATES		W-VP	Rank	Women teachers
1	Mizoram	Under Representation	No School Category		
2	Lakshadweep		0	1	52
3	Daman & Diu		0	1	86
4	Dadra & Nagar Haveli		0	1	81
5	Bihar		0	1	18
6	Andhra Pradesh		0	1	59
7	Manipur		29	2	46
8	Rajasthan		40	3	33
9	Arunachal Pradesh		41	4	34
10	Uttar Pradesh		42	5	37
11	Jammu & Kashmir		42	5	57
12	Sikkim		44	6	53
13	Madhya Pradesh		46	7	64
14	Tripura	Equal	50	No Rank	38
15	Meghalaya		50		73
16	Maharashtra	Higher Representation	52	17	55
17	Chhattisgarh		53	16	63
18	Haryana		54	15	63
19	Himachal Pradesh		55	14	68
20	West Bengal		57	13	57
21	Uttarakhand		62	12	70
22	Jharkhand		62	12	48
23	Tamil Nadu		65	11	83
24	Delhi		68	10	79
25	Assam		71	9	49
26	Karnataka		74	8	79
27	Puducherry		74	8	75
28	Gujarat		75	7	63
29	Odisha		76	6	67
30	Kerala		77	5	81
31	Nagaland		80	4	62
32	Punjab		81	3	81
33	Chandigarh		82	2	84
34	Goa	100	1	75	
35	A& N Islands		No Vice Principals		

Table 12: Representation of Women Vice Principals in UP+S +HS Schools					
S.No.	States		W-VP	Rank	Women Teachers
1	A & N Islands		No Vice Principals		
2	Bihar	Under Representation	0	1	27
3	Dadra & Nagar Haveli		0	1	35
4	Lakshadweep		0	1	41
5	Rajasthan		0	1	26
6	Sikkim		0	1	58
7	Tripura		0	1	29
8	Himachal Pradesh		20	2	37
9	Manipur		22	3	45
10	Uttarakhand		23	4	25
11	Uttar Pradesh		25	5	17
12	Maharashtra		26	6	31
13	West Bengal		30	7	37
14	Assam		31	8	33
15	Jammu & Kashmir		32	9	32
16	Arunachal Pradesh		33	10	25
17	Odisha		33	10	37
18	Chhattisgarh		34	11	43
19	Delhi		39	12	45
20	Gujarat		39	13	29
21	Jharkhand		44	14	45
22	Madhya Pradesh		44	14	40
23	Tamil Nadu		48	15	57
24	Goa		Equal	50	No Rank
25	Nagaland	50		47	
26	Haryana	Higher Representation	51	7	43
27	Karnataka		52	6	37
28	Punjab		59	5	58
29	Puducherry		66	4	51
30	Kerala		71	3	71
31	Meghalaya		76	2	57
32	Andhra Pradesh		100	1	42
33	Chandigarh		100	1	76
34	Daman & Diu		100	1	43
35	Mizoram			SC does not exist	

Table 13: Representation of Women Principals in P+UP+S +HS Schools						
S. No	State		W-P	Rank	Women Teachers	
1	Andhra Pradesh	Under Representation	NA	No rank	59	
2	Dadra & Nagar Haveli		NA	No rank	81	
3	Lakshadweep		NA	No rank	52	
4	Mizoram		No School Category			
5	Arunachal Pradesh		9	1	34	
6	Odisha		13	2	67	
7	Manipur		14	3	46	
8	Bihar		26	4	18	
9	Jammu & Kashmir		26	5	57	
10	Madhya Pradesh		29	6	64	
11	Maharashtra		31	7	55	
12	Sikkim		33	8	53	
13	Haryana		35	9	63	
14	Uttar Pradesh		36	10	37	
15	Rajasthan		36	11	33	
16	Nagaland		39	12	62	
17	West Bengal		40	13	57	
18	Assam		41	14	49	
19	Himachal Pradesh		42	15	68	
20	Chhattisgarh		44	16	63	
21	Uttarakhand		44	17	70	
22	Jharkhand		45	18	48	
23	A & N Islands	Equal	50	No rank	60	
24	Daman & Diu		50		86	
25	Goa		50		75	
26	Karnataka		50		79	
27	Tripura		50		38	
28	Punjab	Higher Representation	56	7	83	
29	Tamil Nadu		58	6	81	
30	Meghalaya		63	5	73	
31	Kerala		65	4	81	
32	Gujarat		65	4	63	
33	Delhi		68	3	79	
34	Chandigarh		85	2	84	
35	Puducherry		88	1	75	

Table 14: Representation of Women Principals in UP+S +HS Schools						
S. No	State		W-Ps	Rank	Women teachers	
1	A & N Islands	Under Representation	NA	No Rank	46	
2	Dadra & Nagar Haveli		NA	No Rank	35	
3	Goa		NA	No Rank	47	
4	Lakshadweep		NA	No Rank	41	
5	Mizoram		No school category			
6	Odisha		NA	No Rank	37	
7	Puducherry		NA	No Rank	51	
8	Tripura		NA	No Rank	29	
9	Arunachal Pradesh		4	2	25	
10	Jammu & Kashmir		11	3	32	
11	Uttarakhand		12	4	25	
12	Uttar Pradesh		13	5	17	
13	Nagaland		14	6	47	
14	Bihar		20	7	27	
15	Rajasthan		20	7	26	
16	Maharashtra		21	8	31	
17	Himachal Pradesh		22	9	37	
18	Gujarat		25	10	29	
19	Assam		26	11	33	
20	Madhya Pradesh		26	11	40	
21	Haryana		30	12	43	
22	Delhi		30	12	45	
23	Karnataka		32	13	37	
24	Tamil Nadu		36	14	57	
25	Punjab		42	15	58	
26	Chhattisgarh		42	15	43	
27	Jharkhand		43	16	45	
28	Manipur		43	16	45	
29	Chandigarh	Equal	50	No rank	84	
30	Sikkim		50		53	
31	West Bengal	Higher Representation	53	5	57	
32	Kerala		56	4	81	
33	Meghalaya		59	3	73	
34	Andhra Pradesh		100	2	59	
35	Daman & Diu		100	1	86	

Appendix 2: Percentage of Male (M) and Female (F) Teachers: All India: (2012-13)														
	P Only		P+UP		P+UP+S+H S		UP Only		UP+ S+HS		P+UP+S		UP+S	
states	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
A & N Islands	32	68	39	61	40	60	60	40	54	46	34	66	0	0
Andhra Pradesh	48	52	51	49	41	59	88	13	58	42	53	47	62	38
Arunachal Pradesh	59	41	58	42	66	34	49	51	75	25	61	39	64	36
Assam	63	37	59	41	51	49	76	24	67	33	49	51	67	33
Bihar	55	45	63	37	82	18	69	31	73	27	68	32	79	21
Chandigarh	13	87	17	83	16	84	0	0	24	76	20	80	0	0
Chhattisgarh	63	37	35	65	37	63	68	32	57	43	33	67	63	38
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	41	59	42	58	19	81	0	100	65	35	30	70	0	0
Daman & Diu	23	77	11	89	14	86	51	49	57	43	32	68	36	64
Delhi	29	71	14	86	21	79	44	56	55	45	17	83	52	48
Goa	11	89	20	80	25	75	21	79	53	47	18	82	34	66
Gujarat	51	49	46	54	37	63	43	57	71	29	35	65	68	32
Haryana	54	46	37	63	37	63	66	34	57	43	40	60	63	37
Himachal Pradesh	55	45	31	69	32	68	74	26	63	37	34	66	68	32
J& K	59	41	59	41	43	57	16	84	68	32	49	51	70	30
Jharkhand	70	30	71	29	52	48	76	24	55	45	66	34	67	33
Karnataka	49	51	43	57	21	79	39	61	63	37	27	73	62	38
Kerala	20	80	24	76	19	81	30	70	29	71	17	83	25	75
Lakshadweep	55	45	50	50	48	52	69	31	59	41	80	20	0	0
Madhya Pradesh	67	33	45	55	36	64	69	31	60	40	46	54	54	46
Maharashtra	53	47	52	48	45	55	44	56	69	31	39	61	62	38
Manipur	52	48	51	49	54	46	63	37	55	45	53	47	49	51
Meghalaya	44	56	30	70	27	73	54	46	43	57	24	76	48	52
Mizoram	52	48	45	55	0	0	65	35	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nagaland	54	46	44	56	38	62	66	34	53	47	46	54	68	32
Odisha	57	43	54	46	33	67	69	31	63	37	56	44	74	26
Puducherry	31	69	25	75	25	75	96	4	49	51	27	73	47	53
Punjab	31	69	15	85	19	81	44	56	42	58	15	85	45	55
Rajasthan	67	33	67	33	67	33	25	75	74	26	72	28	80	20
Sikkim	51	49	46	54	47	53	77	23	42	58	52	48	0	0
Tamil Nadu	17	83	29	71	17	83	17	83	43	57	0	0	0	0
Tripura	74	26	76	24	62	38	56	44	71	29	72	28	50	50
Uttar Pradesh	56	44	60	40	63	37	69	31	83	17	72	28	81	19
Uttarakhand	44	56	35	65	30	70	62	38	75	25	36	64	70	30
West Bengal	55	45	56	44	43	57	79	21	63	37	57	43	60	40
All States	53	47	52	48	34	66	68	32	59	41	48	52	65	35

Appendix 3 Table 1: Status of States for each school category for Acting HM in leadership position

School Categories	Acting HM (P only)			Acting HM (P+UP)			Acting HM (P+UP+S+HS)			Acting HM (UPonly)			Acting HM (UP+S+HS)			Acting HM (P+UP+S)			Acting HM (UP+S)			Summary				% Summary		
	UR	ER	HR	UR	ER	HR	UR	ER	HR	UR	ER	HR	UR	ER	HR	UR	ER	HR	UR	ER	HR	UR	ER	HR	Total	UR	ER	HR
A & N ISLANDS			Y*			Y			y	Y			y					y	SC does not exist			2	0	4	6	33	0	67
ANDHRA PRADESH	Y			Y					Y		Y		y			Y			y			5	1	1	7	71	14	14
ARUNACHAL PRADESH	Y			Y			y			Y			y			Y					y	6	0	1	7	86	0	14
ASSAM	Y			Y					Y	Y			y			Y			y			6	0	1	7	86	0	14
BIHAR	Y			Y			y			Y			y			Y			y			7	0	0	7	100	0	0
CHANDIGARH		Y			Y				Y	SC does not exist			y						y	SC does not exist		1	1	3	5	20	20	60
CHHATTISGARH	Y			Y					Y	Y			y						y	y		5	0	2	7	71	0	29
DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI	Y			Y				y				Y	y			Y				SC does not exist		4	1	1	6	67	17	17
DAMAN & DIU	Y				Y				Y			Y		y		y					y	1	1	5	7	14	14	71
DELHI	Acting HMs position does not exist in Delhi in all school categories																											
GOA			Y			Y		y		Y			y					y			y	2	1	4	7	29	14	57
GUJARAT		Y				Y			Y			Y	y					Y	y			2	1	4	7	29	14	57
HARYANA	Y					Y			Y	Y			y					y			y	4	1	2	7	57	14	29
HIMACHAL PRADESH	Y					Y			Y	Y			y					y	y			4		3	7	57	0	43
JAMMU & KASHMIR	Y			Y			y					Y	y			Y					y	6	0	1	7	86	0	14
JHARKHAND	Y			Y			y			Y			y			Y					y	7	0	0	7	100	0	0
KARNATAKA	Y					Y			y			Y	y					y	y			3	0	4	7	43	0	57
KERALA			Y			Y			Y			Y		y				y			y	7	0	0	7	100	0	0
LAKSHADWEEP	Y			Y			y			Y			y			Y			SC does not exist			6	0	0	6	100	0	0
MADHYA PRADESH	Y			Y					Y	Y			y			Y					y	6	0	1	7	86	0	14
MAHARASHTRA	Y			Y			y				Y		y			Y					y	6	1	0	7	86	14	0
MANIPUR	Y			Y			y			Y			y			Y					y	7	0	0	7	100	0	0

MEGHALAYA			Y		Y		y		Y					y			y	y			2	1	4	7	29	14	57	
MIZORAM	Y		Y			SC Does not exist			Y			SC does not exist			SC does not exist	SC does not exist					3	0	0	3	100	0	0	
NAGALAND	Y		Y			y			Y			y			Y			y			7	0	0	7	100	0	0	
ODISHA	Y		Y			y			Y			y			Y			y			6	1	0	7	86	14	0	
PUDUCHERRY			Y		Y			Y	Y					y			y	y			2	0	5	7	29	0	71	
PUNJAB			Y		Y			Y	Y			y					y	y			3	0	4	7	43	0	57	
RAJASTHAN	Y		Y			y				Y	y				Y			y			6	0	1	7	86	0	14	
SIKKIM	Y		Y					Y	Y			y			Y				SC does not exist		5	0	1	6	83	0	17	
TAMIL NADU			y		Y			Y			Y	y						SC does not exist	SC does not exist		1	0	4	5	20	0	80	
TRIPURA	Y		Y			Y			Y			y			Y					y	6	0	1	7	86	0	14	
UTTAR PRADESH	Y		Y			y			Y			y			Y			y			7	0	0	7	100	0	0	
UTTARAKHAND	Y				Y			Y	Y			y					y	y			4	0	3	7	57	0	43	
WEST BENGAL	Y		Y			y			Y			y			Y			y			7	0	0	7	100	0	0	
Total States	25	2	7	20	0	14	13	3	17	23	2	8	28	1	4	19	2	11	22	0	5	156	10	60	226	69	4	27
All India		34		34		33			33			33			32			27										

Appendix 3: Table 2: Status of States for each school category for Designated HM as leadership position																
School Categories	Designated HM (P+UP)			Designated HM (P+UP+S)			Designated HM (UP+S)			Summary				% Summary		
	UR	ER	HR	UR	ER	HR	UR	ER	HR	UR	ER	HR	Total	UR	ER	HR
A & N ISLANDS	y			Y		y	SC does not exist			2		1	3	67	0	33
ANDHRA PRADESH	y			y			y			3			3	100	0	0
ARUNACHAL PRADESH	y			Y			y			3			3	100	0	0
ASSAM	y			Y			y			3			3	100	0	0
BIHAR	y			Y			y			3			3	100	0	0
CHANDIGARH			y			y	SC does not exist					2	2	0	0	100
CHHATTISGARH	y			y			y			3			3	100	0	0
DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI			y		y		SC does not exist				1	1	2	0	50	50
DAMAN & DIU			y	Y			y			2		1	3	67	0	33
DELHI			y			y	y			1		2	3	33	0	67
GOA			y			y	y			1		2	3	33	0	67
GUJARAT	y			y			y			3			3	100	0	0
HARYANA	y			Y			y			3			3	100	0	0
HIMACHAL PRADESH	y			y			y			3			3	100	0	0
JAMMU & KASHMIR	y			Y			y			3			3	100	0	0
JHARKHAND	y			Y			y			3			3	100	0	0
KARNATAKA	y					y	y			2		1	3	67	0	33
KERALA			y			y			y			3	3	0	0	100
LAKSHADWEEP	y			y			SC does not exist			2			2	100	0	0
MADHYA PRADESH	y			y			y			3			3	100	0	0
MAHARASHTRA	y			y			y			3			3	100	0	0
MANIPUR	y			Y			y			3			3	100	0	0
MEGHALAYA			y			y			y			3	3	0	0	100
MIZORAM	y			SC does not exist			SC does not exist			1			1	100	0	0
NAGALAND	y			Y			y			3			3	100	0	0
ODISHA	y			Y			y			3			3	100	0	0
PUDUCHERRY	y			y			y			3			3	100	0	0
PUNJAB			y			y	y			1		2	3	33	0	67
RAJASTHAN	y			Y			y			3			3	100	0	0
SIKKIM	y			Y			SC does not exist			2			2	100	0	0
TAMIL NADU			y	SC does not exist			SC does not exist					1	1	0	0	100
TRIPURA	y			Y			y			3			3	100	0	0
UTTAR PRADESH	y			Y			y			3			3	100	0	0
UTTARAKHAND	y					y	y			2		1	3	67	0	33
WEST BENGAL	y			Y			y			3			3	100	0	0
Total States	26	0	9	23	1	9	26	0	2	76	1	20	97	78	1	21
	35			33			28									

Appendix 3 Table 3: Status of States for each school category for Vice Principals as Leadership Position													
School Categories	VPs (P+UP+S+HS)			VPs (UP+S+HS)			Summary				% Summary		
States	UR	ER	HR	UR	ER	HR	UR	ER	HR	Total	UR	ER	HR
A & N ISLANDS	No Vice principals			No Vice principals			No Vice principals				No Vice principals		
ANDHRA PRADESH	Y					Y	1		1	2	50	0	50
ARUNACHAL PRADESH	Y			Y			2			2	100	0	0
ASSAM			Y	Y			1		1	2	50	0	50
BIHAR	Y			Y			2			2	100	0	0
CHANDIGARH			Y			Y			2	2	0	0	100
CHHATTISGARH			Y	Y			1		1	2	50	0	50
DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI	Y			Y			2			2	100	0	0
DAMAN & DIU	Y					Y	1		1	2	50	0	50
DELHI			Y	Y			1		1	2	50	0	50
GOA			Y		Y			1	1	2	0	50	50
GUJARAT			Y	Y			1		1	2	50	0	50
HARYANA			Y			Y			2	2	0	0	100
HIMACHAL PRADESH			Y	Y			1		1	2	50	0	50
JAMMU & KASHMIR	Y			Y			2			2	100	0	0
JHARKHAND			Y	Y			1		1	2	50	0	50
KARNATAKA			Y			Y			2	2	0	0	100
KERALA			Y			Y			2	2	0	0	100
LAKSHADWEEP	Y			Y			2			2	100	0	0
MADHYA PRADESH	Y			Y			2			2	100	0	0
MAHARASHTRA			Y	Y			1		1	2	50	0	50
MANIPUR	Y			Y			2			2	100	0	0
MEGHALAYA			y			Y			2	2	0	0	100
MIZORAM	SC Does not exist			SC does not exist			SC does not exist				SC does not exist		
NAGALAND			Y		Y		1		1	2	0	50	50
ODISHA			Y	Y			1		1	2	50	0	50
PUDUCHERRY			Y			Y			2	2	0	0	100
PUNJAB			Y			Y			2	2	0	0	100
RAJASTHAN	Y			Y			2			2	100	0	0
SIKKIM	Y			Y			2			2	100	0	0
TAMIL NADU			Y	Y			1		1	2	50	0	50
TRIPURA		y		Y			1	1		2	50	50	0
UTTAR PRADESH	Y			Y			2			2	100	0	0
UTTARAKHAND			Y	Y			1		1	2	50	0	50
WEST BENGAL			Y	Y			1		1	2	50	0	50
Total States	12	2	19	22	2	9	35	2	29	66	53	3	44
All India	33			33									

Appendix 3 Table 4: Status of States for each school category for Principals as leadership position													
School Categories	Principals (P+UP+S+HS)			Principals (UP+S+HS)			Summary				% Summary		
States	UR	ER	HR	UR	ER	HR	UR	ER	HR	Total	UR	ER	HR
A & N ISLANDS		y		Y			1	1		2	50	50	0
ANDHRA PRADESH	y					y	1		1	2	50	0	50
ARUNACHAL PRADESH	y			Y			2			2	100	0	0
ASSAM	y			Y			2			2	100	0	0
BIHAR	y			Y			2			2	100	0	0
CHANDIGARH			y		y			1	1	2	0	50	50
CHHATTISGARH	y			y			2			2	100	0	0
DADRA & NAGAR HAVELI	y			Y			2			2	100	0	0
DAMAN & DIU		y				y		1	1	2	0	50	50
DELHI			y	Y			1		1	2	50	0	50
GOA		y		Y				1	1	2	0	50	50
GUJARAT			y	Y			1		1	2	50	0	50
HARYANA	y			Y			2			2	100	0	0
HIMACHAL PRADESH	y			Y			2			2	100	0	0
JAMMU & KASHMIR	y			Y			2			2	100	0	0
JHARKHAND	y			y			2			2	100	0	0
KARNATAKA		y		Y				1	1	2	0	50	50
KERALA			y			y			2	2	0	0	100
LAKSHADWEEP	y			Y			2			2	100	0	0
MADHYA PRADESH	y			Y			2			2	100	0	0
MAHARASHTRA	y			Y			2			2	100	0	0
MANIPUR	y			y			2			2	100	0	0
MEGHALAYA			y			y			2	2	0	0	100
MIZORAM	SC does not exist			SC does not exist			SC does not exist				SC does not exist		
NAGALAND	y			Y			2			2	100	0	0
ODISHA	y			Y			2			2	100	0	0
PUDUCHERRY			y	Y			1		1	2	50	0	50
PUNJAB			y	y			1		1	2	50	0	50
RAJASTHAN	y			Y			2			2	100	0	0
SIKKIM	y				y		1	1		2	50	50	0
TAMIL NADU			y	y			1		1	2	50	0	50
TRIPURA		y		Y			1	1		2	50	50	0
UTTAR PRADESH	y			Y			2			2	100	0	0
UTTARAKHAND	y			Y			2			2	100	0	0
WEST BENGAL	y					y	1		1	2	50	0	50
Total States	21	5	8	27	2	5	46	7	15	68	68	10	22
All India	34			34									

References

- Abu-Tineh, Abdullah (2012). Leadership Effectiveness in Jordanian Educational Institution: A comparison of Female and Male Leaders. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*. 41(1), pp.79-94.
- Addi-Racah, Andrey and Hanna Ayalon (2002). Gender Inequality in Leadership Positions of Teachers. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*. 23(2), pp.157-177.
- Addi-Racah, Andrey (2002). Feminisation of Teaching and Principals in the Israeli Education System: A comparative Study. *Sociology of Education*, 75 (3), pp.231-248.
- Arar, Khalid (2010). "I made it": Israeli – Palastinian Women Principals as Leaders. *Education Business and Society: Contemporary Middle Eastern Issues*, 3(4), pp.315-330.
- Aslanargun, Engin (2012). Do Women Principals Really Face With Barriers in Schools? Critics of Glass Ceiling Syndrome in Turkey. *International Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, 4 (2), pp. 255-264
- Banerjee, N (2002). Between Devil and the Deep Sea: Shrinking Options for Women in India. In K.Kapadia (Ed). *The Violence of Development: The Politics of Identity, Gender and Social Inequalities in India* (pp: 43-68). London: Zed books.
- Bass, M. Bernard (ed) (1981). *Stogdill Handbook of Leadership*. New York: The Free Press. (Part 7, Chapter 30).
- Bolam R (1999). Educational administration, leadership and management: towards a research agenda. In: Bush,et al. (ed.), *Educational Management: Redefining Theory, Policy and Practice*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Benham, K.P. Maenette (1997). Silences and Serendes: The Journey of Three Ethnic Minority Women School leaders. *Anthropology and Educational Quarterly*, 28(2), pp.280-307.
- Blackmore, Jill (1995). Participating Parents: A feminist Analysis of Relationship Between the State, community, and Education in Victoria in B.Limerick and H. Neilsom (Ed): *School, Community and Participation*. London: Harcourt, Brace and Janovich.
- Blackmore, Jill (1999). *Troubling Women*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Brinia, Vassiliki (2012). Men versus Women, Educational leadership in Primary Schools in Greece: An Emperical Study. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 26(2), pp.175-191.
- Chabaya, Owence, Symphorosa Rembe and Newman Wadesango, (2009). The persistence of gender inequality in Zimbabwe: factors that impede the advancement of women into leadership positions in primary schools. *South African Journal of Education*, 29, pp.235-251.
- Coleman, Marianne (2003). Gender and the Orthodoxies of Leadership. *School Leadership and Mangement*, 23 (3), pp. 325-339.
- Cristina, B. Gibson (1995). An Investigation of Gender Differences in Leadership across Four Countries. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 26, No. 2 (2nd Qtr., 1995), pp. 255-279.
- Cubillo, leela and Marie Brown (2003). Women in Educational Leadership and management: International Differences? *Journal of Educational Administration*, 41(3) pp. 278-91.

- Dorsey, B. J. (1989). Academic Women at the University of Zimbabwe: Career prospects, aspirations and family role constraints. *Zimbabwe Journal of Educational Research*, 1(3), pp. 342-376.
- European Union, Save the Children and NUEPA (2013). *School Management for Quality Inclusive Education and Decentralised School Governance*. New Delhi: New Concept Information Systems Pvt. Ltd.
- Fuller, Kay (2013). *Gender, Identity and Educational Leadership*. New Delhi: Bloomsbury.
- Fritzgerald, T (2003). Interrogating Orthodox voices: Gender, ethnicity, and educational leadership. *School Leadership and Management* 23(4), pp.431-444.
- Gaus, Nurdiana (2011). Women and school leaderships: Factors deterring female teachers from holding principal positions at elementary schools in Makassar *Advancing Women in Leadership* Vol. 31, pp.175-188. http://advancingwomen.com/awl/awl_wordpress/
- Gewirtz et. al., (1995). *Market Choice and Equity in Education*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Gorgan, M (1996). *Voices of Women aspiring to Superintendency*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Government of India -Planning Commission (2013). *Twelfth Five Year Plan (2012–2017) Vol. 3: Social Sectors*. New Delhi: Sage Publications India Pvt. Ltd.
- Govinda (2002). *Role of Head Teachers in School Management: Case study of Six States*. Asian Network of Training and research Institutions in Educational Planning (ANTRIEP) in collaboration with European Union. New Delhi: NUEPA
- Harford, Judith and Clarie Rush (Ed) (2010). *Have Women made a Difference?- Women in Irish Universities, pp. 1850 – 2010*. Oxford: Peter Lang
- Jandhyala, Kameshwari, Nishi Mehrotra, and Vimala Ramachandran (2014). *A Study of Women Teachers and Achievement of gender and Equity Goals in Secondary Education*. New Delhi: ERU Consultants Pvt Ltd.
- Jandhyala, K and Vimala Ramachandran (2015). Why Women Teachers Matter in Secondary Education. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 50 (32), pp. 48-54.
- Jane, Stachan, Shalom Akao, Bessie Kilavanwa & Daisy Warsal (2010): You have been a servant to all: Melanesian Women’s Educational Leadership Experiences”. *School Leadership and Management*, 30(1), pp. 65-76.
- Killey, Paul (2010). Why Equality? Justifying the liberal egalitarianism. *Critical Review of International Social and political Philosophy* Vol. 13(1). Pp. [Http: eprints.lse.ac.uk](http://eprints.lse.ac.uk) accessed on 15th may 2017.
- Kruger, L. Meta (1996). Gender Issues in School Headship: Quality Versus Power? *European Journal of Education*, 31 (4), pp. 447-461.
- Kyriakoussis, Andreas and Anna Saiti (n.d.). *Underrepresentation of Women in Public Primary School Administration: The experience of Greece*. <http://iejll.synergiesprairies.ca/iejll/index.php/iejll/article/viewFile/605/267>
- Leithwood, Louis K, Anderson S, Wahlstrom (2004). *Review of Research- How Leadership Influences student Learning*. New York: Wallace Foundation.
- Limerick B & Lingard, B (eds) (1995). *Gender and Changing Educational Management*. Sidney: Hodder &Stoughton.

- Lugg A Chatherine & Autumn K Tooms (2010). A Shadow of Ourselves: Identity Erasure and the Politics of Queer Leadership. *School Leadership and Management*, 30(1), pp. 77-91.
- McLay, Margaret and Marie Brown (1999). *Perceptions of Preparation and Training for Headship in Independent Secondary Schools in England: Eight case studies of female head teachers (Paper presented at the BMAS Conference, Manchester, September 1999)*. <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00001217.htm>
- Makura, Alfred Henry (nd). *The Challenges Faced by Women School Heads: The Zimbabwean Experience*. http://www.emasa.co.za/files/emasa2009/13_EMASA2009_Makura.pdf
- Martin, L. Jannifer (ed) (2011). *Women as Leaders in Education (Vol 1)*. New York: Praeger.
- Marshall, C. (1985). The stigmatized Woman: The Professional Woman in a Male Sex-typed Career. *The Journal of Educational Administration*, 23 (2), pp.131-152.
- Metz T, Norma and Sonja R Mc Neely (1998). Women on the Job: A Study of Female High School Principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 34(2), pp. 196-222.
- Miller, Paul (Ed) (2013). *School leadership in the Caribbean: Perceptions, practices and Paradigms*.UK: Symposium Books Ltd.
- Monari Mwebi, Bosire and Angeliki Lazaridou (2008). An International Perspective on Underrepresentation of Female Leaders in Kenya's Primary Schools. *Comparative and International Education*. 37(1), pp 1-22.
http://ir.lib.uwo.ca/cieeci/vol37/iss1/2/?utm_source=ir.lib.uwo.ca%2Fcie-eci%2Fvol37%2Fiss1%2F2&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages (accessed on 16th May 2017)
- Mutopa, S., Maphosa, C., & Shumba, A., (2006). School Management and Teaching: The dilemma of teaching school heads in Zimbabwean secondary schools. *Journal of Educational Studies*,5 (2), pp. 146-164.
- National College of School Leadership (NCSL), UK. (n.d.) *Gender and Headship in the 21st Century*. www.ncsl.org.uk
- National University of Educational Planning and Administration (NUEPA) (2010) (Unpublished). *Report of the Committee on School Leadership Development*. New Delhi: NUEPA
- Ozga, J (1993). *Women in Educational Management*. Buckingham Palace: Open University Press.
- Pande, Rohini and Deanna Ford (2011). Gender Quotas and Female Leadership: A Review: Background Paper for the World Development Report on Gender. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/9120/WDR2012-0008.pdf>. Accessed on 13th April 2017
- Panigrahi, Mans Ranjan (2013). Perceptions of Secondary School Stakeholders towards Women Representation in Educational Leadership in Harari Region if Ethiopia. *International Women Online Journal of Distance Education*, 2(1), January. http://www.wojde.org/FileUpload/bs295854/File/03_21.pdf
- Popescu, Ana-Cristina & Helen M Gunter (2011). Romanian Women Head Teachers and the Ethics of Care. *School Leadership and Management*, 31(3), July, pp.261-279.

- Preciumantuntu, Mudiwa & Les L Bolt (2012). Does the Gender of School Personnel Influence Perceptions of Leadership? *School Leadership and Management*, 32 (3), pp. 261-77.
- Raju and Bagchi (Ed) (1993). *Women and Work in South Asia. Regional Patterns and Perspectives*. London: Routledge.
- Ramachandran, Vimala (2008). *Health and Girls' Education in South Asia: An essential synergy*.
- The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) Regional office for South Asia; and United Nations Girls' Education Initiative (UNGEI).
- Shapira, Jamar, Chalid Arar & Faisal Azaiza (2011). They Didn't Consider me and no one even took me into account: Female School Principals in the Arab Education system in Israel. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 39(1), pp. 25-43.
- Shakeshaft, C (1987). *Women in Educational Administration*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Shenoy-Packer (2014). *India's Working Women and Career Discourses*. Nork: Lexington Books
- Sheth, D. L.(1999). Secularism of Caste and Making of New Middle Class. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 34, pp. 2502-2510.
- Smith, M John (2011). Aspirations to and Perceptions of Secondary Headship: Contrasting Female Teachers and Head Teachers' Perspectives. *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 39(5), pp. 516-535.
- Sperandio, Jill (2011). *Creating And Supporting Women's Leadership In Education: Charting The Effects of International, National and Organizational Cultures* (Gender Equality In Education: Looking Beyond Parity An IIEP Evidence-Based Policy Forum, 3-4 October, Paris: UNESCO-IIEP.
- Sperandio, Jill and Alice Merab Kagoda (n.d). *Advancing Women into Educational Leadership in Developing Countries: The Case of Uganda*.
http://advancingwomen.com/awl/awl_wordpress/advancing-women-into-educational-leadership-in-developing-countries-the-case-of-uganda/
- Sujatha, K (2011). *Improving School Management- learning from Successful Schools*. Asian Network of Training and Research Institutions in Educational Planning (ANTRIEP)- National University for Educational Planning and Administration (NUEPA), New Delhi.
- Trinidad, Cristina and Anthony H. Normore, (2005). Leadership and Gender: A Dangerous Liaison? *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 26(7), pp. 574-590.
<http://www.emeraldinsight.com/journals.htm?articleid=1523647&show=abstract>
- U-DISE (Unified District Information on School Education) (2012-13). New Delhi: NUEPA
- Weyer, Birgit, *et.al* (2007). Twenty Years Later: Explaining the Persistence of the Glass Ceiling for Women Leaders. *Women in Management Review*, 22(6), pp. 482-496
- Woods J.T. (2005). Feminist Stand Point Theory and Muted Group Theory: Commonalities and Divergences. *Women and language*, (28), pp. 61-72.

NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATIONAL PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION

National University of Educational Planning and Administration (NUEPA) is an autonomous body which was upgraded by the Government of India from NIEPA (established in 1970) to a National University in the year 2006 for conferring the Degree on educational planning and administration, which was a successor to the erstwhile Unesco-sponsored Asian Institute of Educational Planning and Administration. The University is primarily concerned with improvements in policy, planning and management of education both at micro and macro levels. With this end in view it undertakes research, conducts studies, offers consultancy and advisory services and organises training programmes. The University is concerned with all levels of education. A significant aspect of the University's programmes has been the services that it has offered to the national and international community.

THE OCCASIONAL PAPERS SERIES

Occasional Papers Series is intended to diffuse the findings of the research work relating to various facets of educational planning and administration, carried out by the faculty of the NUEPA. The papers are referred to an expert in the field to ensure academic rigour and standards. Occasional Papers are circulated among a special group of scholars as well as planners and administrators to generate discussion on the subject.

The facts and figures stated, conclusions reached and views expressed in the occasional paper are of the author and should not be attributed to NUEPA.