EXPLORING FEMALE K-12 ADMINISTRATORS' EXPERIENCES WITH HORIZONTAL VIOLENCE: A MULTIPLE CASE STUDY

by

Dr. Midge Odermann Mougey

December 2004

A DISSERTATION

This effort is dedicated to:

- Mother and Dad Odermann for planting the seed.

- Charlie for nurturing the seed and encouraging its growth over the past 30 years.

- Heidi, Genevieve, Kati, and Joel for providing so many reasons to bring it to fruition. The harvest is truly in!!

Your presence in my life and the blanket of love you have wrapped me in have provided a force most powerfully evidenced in this work.

Heartfelt thanks to:

- Dr. Valerian Odermann, O.S. B. for editing support and moral support. Your words of encouragement have meant everything over the course of this study and my journey to the Doctorate.

- Dr. Larry Dlugosh, my advisor, who never once initiated a prodding reminder but who supported me enthusiastically whenever I did!! Your abiding belief in the value of this work was invaluable.

- Committee Members Dr. Jody Isernhagen, Dr. Dixie Senger, and Dr. Marilyn Grady for reviewing, challenging, and appreciating my work.

- Dr. Dana Miller for sparking my appreciation of qualitative methodology and for auditing the research process and validating my work.

Table of Contents

Territory

Are you more if I'm less?
Do I breathe your air
Or fly in your space?
When I take up more room,
Do you become constrained?
Do you value me more if
I'm beholden to you?
Do you value me less
When I'm free and I soar?
Are you less
If I'm more?

Josefowitz (1983, p. 74)

Chapter One

Introduction

One of the ironies of women succeeding in their profession has been the emergence of an understudied phenomenon: their envy of one another. Many women, while they want wholeheartedly to succeed and put enormous energy forth to do so, do not want other women to succeed. The phenomenon has been identified as Horizontal Violence, Horizontal Hostility, Indirect Aggression, or an especially descriptive phrase, The Tall Poppy Syndrome. Regardless of the name, it is "the female-to-female harassment of women toward other women—especially successful women" (Funk, 2000, p. 244), which has been observed and analyzed in the nursing literature for over two decades. Yet, the ugliness of horizontal violence is exacerbated by its covert and underexposed reality.

Heim and Murphy (2001) identified the covert nature of horizontal violence among women succinctly: "Even though this issue is so pervasive, rarely do we see much written about it. It's as though this is women's dirty little secret" (p. 10). In *Woman's Inhumanity to Woman*, Phyllis Chesler (2001) speaks of this secretive reality,

> A peculiar silence surrounds woman's inhumanity to woman. Feminists have mainly remained silent; I have remained silent. Is it simply too painful to remember one's own betrayal at female hands, too difficult to analyze the ways in which women—myself included, collaborate in the undoing of other women; too frightening to face the wrath of women for breaking the silence? (p. 25)

This secretive aspect pervades personal interviews in the literature on horizontal violence: "For years, I could never even talk about this, except to my husband. I don't really have a name for what happened" (Chesler, 2001, p. 389). This reticence in the face of the phenomenon has kept it from being addressed with the attention it deserves.

Victims of horizontal violence have borne the pain silently; ". . . they [have] never discussed the issues with one another, and were uncertain about whether their perceptions were in fact accurate or their experiences unique. Once they began the discussion, they realized that their experiences in fact formed a pattern. . . ." (Estrich, 2000, p. 43). Often fear and isolation have paralyzed women from sharing their stories in regard to this harassment and hurt. Why delve into the "secrets" harbored by professional women? It is the question of any dysfunctional system behavior, yet,

> Only when women come together do patterns become clear; only by comparing notes do a series of individual decisions become an instance of collective discrimination. It is only by collecting these experiences that individual women, even the most extraordinary, have the opportunity to fulfill their potential. (Estrich, 2001, p. 46)

Chesler (2001) pinpointed the heart of the issue: "It is impossible to change one's behavior if we do not first name that behavior. By acknowledging the shadow side of female-female relationships, I hope that women can begin to transform envy into compassion, betrayal into cooperation" (p. 7). The naming of the phenomenon can aid women to overcome the pain and, additionally, devise appropriate strategies that help them adopt more productive ways of relating in the professional world.

Context of the Problem

In the school year 1987-88, 2% of principals in the U.S. were women; by the school year 1999-2000, 35% were women (Blackman & Fenwick, 2000). The National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) research showed that the percentage of women in the principalship increased from 20% to 42% between 1988 and 1998. The percentage of new principals who are female is even higher. Between 1987-88 and 1993-94 there was a 48% increase in female leadership.

As women exercise more leadership in education, they need a clearer understanding of how they can cooperate with one another, especially in promoting and supporting each other as they advance to these leadership positions. They need strategies to confront the professional and personal hurdles faced as a result of rank advancement.

> Given the reality of female oppression, how women treat each other matters more, not less. I want my readers to acknowledge that what women do or refuse to do for other women matters deeply. I want women to understand that we have real power over each other. I want women to use this power consciously and ethically. (Chesler, 2001, p. 6)

This qualitative research project examined the phenomenon of horizontal violence within the advancement ranks of education in the Midwest's K-12 system in the early 21st century. The study aimed to raise awareness of the consequences of female-to-female horizontal violence in the educational profession. There was also a personal motivating factor; the study grew, in part, out of the researcher's inability to understand and identify frustrations and hurt experienced at the onset of her administrative career.

Purpose Statement

The primary purpose of this qualitative multiple case study was to raise consciousness about advancement for female educational leaders. By understanding the forms and shapes of horizontal violence, the effects on leaders, and ways to deflect the negative behaviors, female leaders are more likely to counter these effects in positive, productive ways.

A secondary purpose was to educate aspiring female administrators about the possibility of horizontal violence in their careers. If aspiring female leaders are somewhat prepared for horizontal violence, they may establish proactive strategies to address it as it occurs, thereby minimizing its impact on their advancement.

Third, the study can serve as inspiration for veteran administrators who have experienced the phenomenon but did not know how prevalent it was for upwardly mobile women. Without this awareness, female administrators are more likely to internalize the negative input from other women and isolate themselves. The experiences of some, shared in this study, will serve to enlighten others.

Research Questions

The Grand Tour question: How do K-12 Female Administrators describe their experiences with Horizontal Violence as they advance through the professional ranks of educational leadership?

Research Sub-Questions

1. What issues do women face with female subordinates that men rarely have to deal with?

2. What are some of the behaviors women have observed in other women that impede their effectiveness as a female school leader?

3. What kinds of discouraging or contrary behaviors have women experienced from other women as they have progressed into an educational leadership position?

4. Why do women use these behaviors? (Can women identify some motivations for any of these behaviors?)

5. Female socialization often includes work in "playing nice" and "getting along." What impact do women perceive this has on dealing with indirect aggression from other women?

6. What strategy (or strategies) have women used with female staff members which has proven to be effective in fostering more positive feelings?

7. What have been documented as some of the most hurtful incidents of indirect aggression from other women?

8. What strategies have women employed to protect themselves and this career?

9. Did/Do women perceive there were/are others experiencing these types of feelings or did/do they perceive they were/are alone?

Definitions of Terms

Catfight—Behaviors of "bitchy" competitiveness that women engage in when they see others attaining more power and value in a social or professional structure.

Horizontal hostility—a phrase used synonymously and interchangeably with "horizontal violence."

Horizontal violence—Female-to-female harassment, especially of successful women, which is often a hidden barrier to women's success. Funk (2000) cited Blanton, Lybecker, and Spring (1998) to define it as,

> . . . harmful behavior, via attitudes, words and other behaviors, that are directed to us by another colleague. Horizontal violence controls, humiliates, denigrates or injures the dignity of another. Horizontal violence indicates a lack of mutual respect and value for the worth of the individual and denies another's fundamental human rights" (p. 245).

Indirect aggression—Anonymous and covert aggression. The attacker makes efforts to remain hidden. Attacks are generally circuitous in an effort to remain anonymous thereby protecting oneself and avoiding confrontation, social disapproval, condemnation, or retaliation. Behaviors include the following: backbiting, gossiping, spreading vicious rumors, refusing to return a smile or to talk, stalking out of the room, complaining to others behind another's back, telling lies, stomping off, sulking, planting damaging information or insinuations, taking revenge by sabotage and property

destruction, shunning or ostracizing, refusing to make eye contact, pretending that a person doesn't exist, making faces, making derogatory gestures, shutting the other out of the group, becoming friends with another as revenge, ignoring, planning secretly to bother the other, and encouraging others to dislike someone.

Physical aggression—Using physical force or handling to bend another to one's will. Behaviors include hitting, kicking, tripping, shoving, pushing, and pulling.

Queen bee syndrome—A state of affairs wherein a token high-powered woman who has broken through stereotypes so enjoys the view from the top that she is disinclined to help other women attain similar status, often clinging to the thought that "I made it to the top and no one helped me."

Relational bullying—The systematic diminishment of a bullied child's sense of self through ignoring, isolating, excluding, or shunning (Coloroso, 2003).

Tall poppy—"The *tall poppy*, according to the 1997 edition of the Oxford Dictionary of New Zealand English, is 'a conspicuously successful person.' The term is of Australian origin and was first recorded in the Australian National Dictionary in 1902. The 1982 supplement to the Oxford English Dictionary in Australia defines a 'tall poppy' in Australia as 'an especially well paid, privileged or distinguished person.' The 1988 edition of the Australian National Dictionary defines a 'tall poppy' as a 'person who is conspicuously successful and (frequently) as one whose distinction, rank or wealth attracts envious notice or hostility'" (Mouly & Sankaran, 2003, p. 1).

Tall poppy syndrome—A term popularized in Australia to define a situation in which talented, outspoken, successful females who rise in their particular professional fields become targets to "get their heads lopped off" because they are easily spotted as

they stand above the crowd. "The tall poppy syndrome (TPS) refers to the tall poppying of tall poppies" (Mouly & Sankaran, 2003, p. 1).

Tall poppying—A verb form that means to cut a tall poppy down to size.

Too Hillary—Reference to Hillary Rodham Clinton, former First Lady of the United States of America, who is a politically sophisticated and successful woman in her own right. She is presently a Congresswoman from New York. When applied, the term is meant to convey the notion that the woman in question is being too aggressive, too confident, or too successful.

Verbal aggression—Any verbal exchange meant to undermine or harm another. Behaviors include yelling, insulting, teasing, and threatening to hurt the other, and calling the other names.

Assumptions, Limitations, Delimitations

Assumptions

1. Participants being interviewed and responding to surveys were sharing not only "their truth" but also an important part of "the truth."

2. Participants were participating without hidden agendas but with willingness to share their experiences and implicitly help those who come after them.

3. Participants were engaged freely and without coercion.

4. A narrative style was the most appropriate form to elicit significant information on the issue being studied.

5. The experiences of female educational leaders in this midwestern state reflected the experiences of women in educational leadership across the United States.

Limitations

1. The researcher was aware of only those things shared by the selected participants.

2. Participants might have been reluctant to share the full truth of some experiences, even as they knew them, due to lack of comprehension or hurt.

3. The information generated by the interview questions was filtered through the lenses of the participants and may have been unique to a particular participant.

4. The participants were not observed in the natural field setting.

5. Not all participants were equally articulate or possessed the skill to communicate their particular stories with parallel depth.

6. The participants' connectedness with the issues, awareness of their strengths, and ability to articulate emotions arising from their experiences impacted the outcome of the interviews.

7. The researcher acknowledged that, because of her own perceptions about the research topic, interpretations might have been skewed, regardless of efforts to remain objective about the topic.

Delimitations

1. The researcher's relationship and interviewing skills filtered interpretations and perceptions.

2. The researcher recruited "subjects" only from the pool of female administrators listed in the educational directory of the state's professional organization for school administrators'.

3. The researcher recruited "subjects" among current female administrators who had been in their present leadership position for eight or less years.

4. The entire pool of subjects was from a midwestern state, an area that sociologically holds traditional views about gender. This may have affected the responses of the subjects.

5. The researcher's roots and life experiences have all been in the Midwest, thus influencing her style of communication, personal beliefs about gender and horizontal violence, and interview techniques.

6. Since the timeline for interviews was the first half of 2004, the pressures faced by educational leaders at this time of the year may have influenced interest in participating, heightened anxiety about anonymity, or prevented an appropriate candidate from participating.

Target Audiences

Target audiences for this multiple case study were many. Here are listed seven. One audience was all women. Valuable insight can be gained by developing an understanding of socialization then choosing to change unsatisfactory behaviors that have been drilled into one's being. For horizontal violence to be diminished an understanding of the phenomenon is imperative, as well as its devastating effects on other women (in this case, administrative leaders in education). In order to change the status quo, women need opportunities to be part of the conversation with other women and to surface successful strategies for dealing with horizontal violence.

Female administrators and leaders were another targeted audience of this study. As females advance through leadership ranks in the infrastructure of their careers the potential negative impact that their efforts will encounter may aid them in creating support systems and protective devices to guard themselves against stress, pain and

self-doubt. Being aware of strategies that are helpful can mean the difference between success and failure.

Besides those already in the filed, aspiring female administrators may also gain insight about strategies to deal with horizontal violence prior to initiating their work in the educational leadership realm. Armed with the knowledge of the possible dangers and risks, they are more likely to be ready to handle the difficulties which can arise from the jealousy of subordinates, newly-defined job descriptions, and a shift in the existing power structure of a building or district. Such knowledge may also serve as a rudder to determine one's eventual career choice steering away those neither equipped nor desirous of such potential difficulties in their career paths.

College and university faculty need to be cognizant of horizontal violence and the impact it can have on the novice female administrator as she begins her career in the administrative field. Training in problem-solving in this arena may provide a stabilizing element for women hoping to advance themselves in the leadership ranks of the education world. The university setting is the most obvious place to start the conversation among women and to help them begin to establish the collegial support systems that will be necessary to sustain their growth in the profession and emotional health when they eventually encounter the behaviors of horizontal violence. To allow women to leave the university setting unprepared to deal with the potentially devastating behavior of future subordinates would be irresponsible, at the least.

Superintendents, and other central office personnel, would benefit from the information as a way to more fully understand the pressures of developing a leadership style for newly emerging female leaders. It also would allow superintendents to allocate

the emotional support and backing necessary to insure success for new female leaders in the district. Since, traditionally, men fill most central office positions, and horizontal violence is a largely female issue, men can benefit by learning about the phenomenon in order to provide the support female leaders will need. A cognizance of the realities that female leaders face will enable male counterparts or superiors to be part of the solution rather than inadvertently contributing to the perpetuation of dysfunctional and counterproductive behaviors among female subordinates.

Boards of education would gain a fuller understanding of the realities faced by the female leaders and be ever watchful of saboteurs or behaviors that undermine the efforts and work of the administrators in the district. As the official body of policy makers for a district, the board will be more effective as a thinking, discriminating, and educated group that is aware of the real issues faced by their employees.

Another targeted audience was professional administrative organizations devised to offer counsel and resources. Through their awareness of the particular issues women may face from other women in the professional arena, they could offer educational materials, legal counsel, support in developing strategies for dealing with these difficult issues, and create networks of supportive veterans who could provide the collaborative assistance to build mastery for fledgling administrators.

Significance of the Study

Participants found their involvement in this project an opportunity to examine and clarify their experiences with horizontal violence during their advancement in educational leadership roles. In his book, *Man's Search for Meaning,* Viktor Frankl (1984) quoted a German poet, "What you have experienced, no power on earth can take from you"

(p. 90). Frankl went on to say that while we are products of our collective experiences, we have the choice to determine our own response to the experience. The response to any experience is more likely to be productive if there is a foundational understanding of the experience. By raising awareness of the phenomenon of horizontal violence, participants and readers may have the opportunity to determine a more positive and beneficial response to similar experiences in the future.

Furthermore, while some of the participants encountered difficult and challenging experiences, they were unaware that such challenges existed for other people. Some participants had internalized fault and all had experienced isolation due to lack of understanding of the phenomenon. In sharing their stories, they developed new resolve or understanding of their experiences. Clarity was found in the retelling of personal stories.

The data show that in spite of the burdens placed on women by others, some have overcome the negativity and risen to positions of leadership, while enjoying successful, productive careers. These participants had a story to share that can provide support and encouragement for new and aspiring female leaders as well as a framework for creating strategies and support systems within their existing situations.

The findings highlight the need for a shift in the design of university courses to include curricula to enhance the leadership potential of all students and give aspiring female candidates strategies to cope with indirect aggression from other women. Women who understand horizontal violence may be in a better position to make choices about their response to the phenomenon and may be more able to develop effective strategies to respond to it when it occurs.

Tall Poppies

See the tall poppies!
They stick up too high.
Let's cut them down.
They make us feel short!

See the tall poppies!
They are growing too fast.
Let's cut them down
So we don't have to grow too.

See the tall poppies!
They have some power.
Let's cut them down
They make us feel weak.

See the tall poppies!
They know too much.
Let's cut them down
So we don't have to learn.

See the tall poppies!
They are "in the know."
Let's cut them down
So we won't feel left out.

See the tall poppies!
We've cut them all down.
Now we can relax
And stay short poppies forever!

Funk (2000, p. 252)

This hatred of the good is not merely ugly; it is destructive. A culture that attacks its highest achievers will mow down its tall poppies—and end up with nothing but weeds.   Robert Tracinski (2003)

Chapter Two

Review of the Literature

A review of the literature available on horizontal violence quickly indicated that this is a relatively new field of study. Most of the books and articles on the topic have been written in the past twelve years with one exception: in nursing literature. Information about horizontal violence dates back to the 1980s when the subject was quite evident in nursing Master's theses. While the study of horizontal violence, and its byproducts, is fairly recent, as early as 1966 California educational psychologist Norma D. Feshbach found that adult women obtained "higher scores on measures of covert hostility" (Chesler, 2001, p. 88) than did their male counterparts. Since that time other researchers have looked at pieces of this phenomenon. The research of the 1990s to the present has been substantial. Kaj Bjorkqvist, Karin Osterman, Kirsti Lagerspetz, Anne Campbell, Susan Estrich, Phyllis Chesler, Judith Lorber, Claudia Bepko, Jo-Ann Krestan, Rachel Simmons, Mary Pipher, Lyn Mikel Brown, Carol Gilligan, Susan Faludi, Pat Heim and Susan Murphy all have contributed to the previously understudied phenomenon of hidden aggression in girls and women.

Information on horizontal violence, or the tall poppy syndrome, is especially apparent in the professional literature of Australia, New Zealand, and England. This may be because the tall poppy syndrome, as a named phenomenon, originated in Australia's penal colonies in the 1700s. It was an outgrowth of the bitterness and hostility that existed between two groups of people in Australia at that time: "One was carrying a gun

while the other was wearing the chains of English Imperial slavery" (Anonymous, Internet source, retrieved November 4, 2003).

Historically, Australia has fed on this "cultural divide" which came between the common person and those who felt or acted superior to them. While the animosity toward the "elite" appeared to be well grounded in the penal colonists, it is perpetuated today in such a way that bears little resemblance to its origins. Today, the term describes the way people, most usually women, target other women who appear to stand out in the crowd because of their professional success. Robert Tracinski (2003, ¶ 4) saw the phenomenon at work transculturally:

> [A]nyone who dares to poke his head above the crowd must be attacked, denigrated, and brought down to the common level. I don't know whether this Tall Poppy Syndrome, as it is called, is really typical of Australian culture, but it is a widespread trend in American culture.

In an effort to dispel the negative connotations of the tall poppy syndrome in its birthplace, in 1999 Prime Minister, John Howard, issued a new preamble to Australia's constitution, which included the line "we value excellence." Later, Howard explained this addition by stating that this was "a blow against the tall poppy syndrome and if there's one thing we need to get rid of in this country it is our tall poppy syndrome" (Anonymous, Internet source, retrieved November 4, 2003).

The issue of the tall poppy syndrome, horizontal violence, or indirect aggression by women has an ignoble history. Anthropologists, psychologists, and sociologists have studied the ways females connect in human and animal societies for generations. Historians and scholars have even created words to specifically describe certain female behaviors. In the 1600s the word "cat" was used in the Oxford English Dictionary ". . . as a term of contempt for a spiteful or backbiting woman" (Tanenbaum, 2002, p. 29). The

term "catfight" first appeared in 1919 as a term used "in a mocking, derogatory way to describe a vicious clash between women" (Tanenbaum, 2002, p. 29). "Catfight" is still used today to describe female behavior in much the same context as men generally use the term to describe "women's behavior that looks irrational and highly inappropriate" (Heim & Murphy, 2001, p. 5).

Our modern western culture has enlarged the menu of words or phrases to define and denigrate females and their behaviors: snipe, castrating female, ball-buster, bitch, catty, witch, cunt, butch, slut, lesbian, frigid, manly and dyke. Each epithet illustrates the violation of a girl's prescribed role as a caregiver and promotes the culturally imbedded idea that any behavior of an aggressive nature is unfeminine, and therefore, unacceptable (Simmons, 2002). These words became increasingly familiar in the vernacular of the 1980s and continue to be used interchangeably to attack, and often to silence women. Secunda (1992) summarized

> How aggression is *interpreted* is a far more telling cultural index of who *ought* to be feisty and who ought not. For a man to assert himself is to fulfill his cultural and biological destiny—and to *fail* to do so is to be a disgrace to his sex. For a woman to assert herself is to be a "barracuda," a "ball-breaker," a "dyke." (p. 24)

"Aggression is a powerful barometer of our social values" (Simmons, 2002, p. 16) and western cultures view physical aggression and domination in boys as fairly normal (Gurian, 1996; Harbin, 2000; Heim & Murphy, 2001; Lorber, 1994; Pollock, 1998). In fact, sociologist Anne Campbell asserted, "attitudes toward aggression crystallize sex roles" (Simmons, 2002, p. 16). When boys are agitated or angry with other boys they will engage in various and assorted physical behaviors, such as hitting, pushing, punching, and shoving. However, there is a cultural taboo against girls engaging in like behavior. Girls are socialized away from this type of behavior and generally encouraged to express

themselves nonphysically (Chesler, 2001; Estrich, 2000; Heim & Murphy, 2001; Lorber, 1994; Simmons, 2002; Tanenbaum, 2002) when they are angry, upset, or find themselves in a competitive situation.

As a result, rather than engaging in overtly physical or aggressive behaviors when they are distressed, girls will usually find more subtle and covert outlets. U.S. authors and researchers (Chesler, 2001; Coloroso, 2003; Estrich, 2000; Heim & Murphy, 2001; Lorber, 1994; Pipher, 1994; Simmons, 2002; Tanenbaum, 2002) have compiled a list of covert behaviors, labeled as indirect aggression or horizontal violence. Some of the behaviors follow:

- socially sabotaging by becoming friends with another as revenge or trying to get others to dislike a targeted person;
- gossiping;
- using vague double entendres;
- embarking upon a campaign to enlist others into their own private army of righteous indignation;
- distorting or improving upon the truth and thus targeting others for exile or confrontation;
- telling lies and spreading rumors behind another's back;
- stomping off and sulking;
- planting damaging information or insinuations;
- taking revenge by sabotage and property destruction;
- shunning or ostracizing a target person from a social group;

- refusing to make eye contact or otherwise pretending that a person doesn't exist;

- making faces or derogatory gestures to others;

- name-calling, insulting, teasing, threatening; and

- shutting the other out.

In Finland, Bjorqvist, Lagerspetz, and Osterman (1992) have researched indirect aggression for over a decade and have developed a "Direct and Indirect Aggression Scale" (DIAS). The DIAS uses the following phrases as indicators of indirect aggression:

- shuts the other one out of the group;

- becomes friends with another as a kind of revenge;

- ignores the other one;

- gossips about the one he/she is angry with;

- tells bad or false stories about the other one;

- plans secretly to bother the other one;

- says bad things behind the other one's back;

- says to others "Let's not be with him/her!";

- tells the other one's secrets to a third person;

- writes small notes where the other one is criticized;

- criticizes the other one's hair or clothing; and

- tries to get others to dislike the person he/she is angry with.

Apparently then, considerable thought has been given to the behaviors and actions that represent horizontal violence. The question that burns to be asked is: Why has the body of research literature been so slow in exposing horizontal violence to public

scrutiny? Some (Chesler, 2001; Estrich, 2000; Funk, 2000; Lorber, 1994; Simmons, 2002; Tanenbaum, 2002) assert that there has been a veil of secrecy surrounding the indirect aggression of women. The wall of silence has been perpetuated for several reasons: inability to name the phenomenon which was being experienced, shame and embarrassment among women who resorted to subversive behaviors, shame and embarrassment among women who have been victimized by other women's actions, and lack of understanding of the phenomenon (Chelser, 2001; Funk, 2000). Chesler (2001) confessed, "A peculiar silence surrounds woman's inhumanity to woman. Feminists have mainly remained silent; I have remained silent." (p. 25) Similarly, Simmons (2002) claimed "Silence is deeply woven into the fabric of the female experience. It is only in the last 30 years that we have begun to speak the distinctive truths of women's lives" (p. 3) even though experts agree that every female, girl or woman, has a story within them to tell about horizontal violence.

Slowly women are being invited to move beyond a guarded secrecy and to speak out about the realties of their socialization. As early as 1976, Betty Friedan published An Open Letter to the Women's Movement in which she publicly acknowledged the existence of "a cannibalization of leadership" (Chesler, 2001, p. 447) within the ranks of the National Organization of Women. She also urged feminists to stop manipulating each other using horizontal violence. She went on to say that the organization was more likely to "die from internal bleeding long before they succumb to external pressure" (Chesler, 2001, p. 447), a brave voicing of the issues faced by an organization which prided itself in its advocation of all women.

The former secretness of horizontal violence has been undone in recent years with the influx of books, Internet accessibility to worldwide research papers, and the emergence of vocal women in many levels of society. There are several themes that dominate the literature on horizontal violence and indirect aggression: (a) the socialization of girls, (b) relationship dynamics for girls and women, and (c) the impact of leadership on relationships. This researcher will explore each of the themes in the remainder of this chapter.

The Socialization of Girls

The prescribed roles and attitudes for girls (pre-women) in Western culture are first seen in hospital nurseries across the country with pink bows and insipid comments made to and about newborns. Parents expect—showing how fully they have absorbed the cultural milieu—that even at birth, boys will exhibit certain qualities and characteristics and girls will be defined by a different set of criteria. New parents use words like "soft," "sweet," and "delicate" to describe infant girls and "strong," "active," and "robust" to describe their baby boys (Hales, 1999, p. 120). The communication of these expectations begins even prenatally as parents paint nurseries, purchase clothes for the anticipated baby and stockpile items in particular colors depending on the child's sex. While it is easy to spot the cultural markers that present themselves as color or specific toys, it is more difficult to see, identify, and understand the cultural expectations which impose a more lasting effect on children via the socialization process. The piece of the process that this researcher will explore is the socialization of girls to reject overt aggression and hostility as a means to express anger, hurt, jealousy, and hate and the adoption of covert expressions of aggression.

By age 11, girls have chosen indirect aggression as their preferred style (Heim & Murphy, 2001, p. 111) and they have a fairly well developed set of behaviors with which to handle other girls and boys. The set of behaviors is quite different depending on which sex the girl is interacting with at the time. Girls learn that to be seen as "all girl" they must be uncomplaining, yielding, and adoring (Secunda, 1992), that the primary expectation is that they must be nice at all costs (Heim & Murphy, 2001), and that any girl exhibiting signs of competence or superiority must be criticized, rejected (Heim & Murphy, 2001), or "scapegoated" (Pipher, 1994). Through indoctrination into this code of goodness, young girls learn to submerge their authentic feelings and adopt a standard of nice in order to be accepted and heard by, first their families, and eventually the broader society (Brown & Gilligan, 1992; Pipher, 1994).

While girls are taught to value confidence and strength in boys, anthropologist Marjorie Harness Goodwin (Heim & Murphy, 2001) discovered that girls at play would penalize and even ostracize a girl who seemed too confident. Young girls are advised to minimize their sense of self and confidence by putting themselves down to other girls and rushing to assure another girl of her own superiority (Wiseman, 2002) or "deliberately building up [another's] self-esteem" (Heim & Murphy, 2001, p. 63) in an effort to retain position in groups and cliques. Yet, a 1998 study by Canadian psychologists Joyce F. Benenson and Deborah Bennaroch showed that "girls were upset if their friends were in any way superior to them" (Chesler, 2001, p. 107). This is across the board—a move into the political mode when resources are scarce (Chesler, 2001).

Culturally trained that being aggressive is acceptable only for men (Pipher, 1994; Tanenbaum, 2002), girls then use more covert methods to instill hurt. They discover at an

early age that the most powerful tool in their arsenal is "relational bullying" (Coloroso, 2003; Simmons, 2002), another form of indirect aggression. They learn that indirect aggression is a "low-risk, low-injury approach" (Chesler, 2001, p. 76) to expressing their hurt and anger and in fact, "covert aggression isn't just about not getting caught; half of it is looking like you'd never mistreat someone in the first place" (Simmons, 2002, p. 23). The aura of innocence and purity is central to using indirect aggression. Pulitzer Prize winning science writer Natalie Angier supported this contention, stating that

> Indirect aggression is anonymous aggression. It is backbiting, gossiping, and spreading vicious rumors. It is seeking to rally others against the despised but then denying the plot when confronted. The use of indirect aggression increases over time, not just because girls don't generally use their fists to make their point, but because the effectiveness of indirect aggression is tied to the fluency of a person's social intelligence; the more sophisticated the person the cleverer her use of the dorsal blade. (Chesler, 2001, p. 76)

The more sophisticated a girl is, the better chance she has of looking innocent and remaining anonymous, thereby able to continue to undermine and belittle other girls. Indirect aggression was seen as "slippery, impossible to nail down" and when done right was "disguised beneath a veneer of politeness or gentleness" (Tanenbaum, 2002, p. 62). The dehumanizing aspect of it was that the aggressor always has a way out by making the victimized female feel even less worthy because she is able to say, "I didn't mean it that way" or "You're just being paranoid" or "Your skin is too thin." This kind of denial by the aggressor, submerges the victim in further self-doubt, decreases her self-esteem and makes her an easier target for future aggression. All the time, the aggressor appears quite innocent. The "earnest denials that one has intended to harm anyone" (Chesler, 2001, p. 44) accompanied by a smile are the ultimate weapon of the sophisticated aggressor.

Girls learn early that it is absolutely vital to avoid social disapproval. Simmons (2002) said it is much more lady-like to

> . . . retreat beneath a surface of sweetness to hurt each other in secret . . . ,[to] pass covert looks and notes, manipulate quietly over time, corner one another in hallways, turn their backs, whisper, and smile. These acts, which are intended to escape detection and punishment, are epidemic in middle-class environments where the rules of femininity are most rigid. (p. 22)

The reason girls, and women, will go to such lengths is to avoid retaliation and social condemnation (Brown & Gilligan, 1992; Heim & Murphy, 2001). The socialization process of girls is very explicit about what is tolerated and what is judged harshly. Open warfare is not tolerated and there appear to be social rewards for the girl who is the most covert and able to remain anonymous while inflicting the greatest hurt and harm. Girls are socialized to not tolerate meanness or overt hostility so it is the ultimate coup d'état for a girl to be able to attack in such a way as to remain hidden. The more circuitous the attack, the better chance one has of avoiding detection and possible social consequences. A new spin on this reality: adolescent girls have begun to use the Internet to bully and demean others. Rosalind Wiseman says that online bullying "had a particular appeal for girls, who specialize in emotional rather than physical harassment and strive to avoid direct confrontation" (Harmon, 2004).

Indirect aggression is cruel and carries long-lasting effects on the emotional development of girls and women. Why then, would girls choose to employ the methods of horizontal violence against their own gender?

It is important to understand the notion that females do not choose a particular behavior, they are "schooled in emotional expressivity" (Hales, 1999, p. 262) by the messages they receive from their culture and the society in which they live and are

nurtured. Clinical psychologist Mary Pipher further clarified the distinction when she stated, "I was taught to understand people within the context of their culture. I learned to ask, 'What is the culture expecting of them? What is their script?'" (Pipher, 1994, p. 249)

The "script" that young girls have been handed, in many western cultures, is one of inequality of the sexes. Judith Lorber, in her book, *Paradoxes of Gender*, stated gender inequality is "the devaluation of 'women' and the social domination of 'men'" (Lorber, 1994, p. 35). She said that this is produced and maintained by "identifiable social processes and built into the general social structure and individual identities deliberately and purposefully" (Lorber, 1994, p. 35).

The script may also include the notion that there is a "hard-wiring" (Hales, 1999, p. 121) of female brains *in utero* or it is in girls' developmental tea leaves (Simmons, 2002) to respond in certain ways to aggression or that women are innately reluctant to be directly aggressive (Heim & Murphy, 2001) or that hidden aggression is just part of the rite of passage (Simmons, 2002) which young girls must travel in their quest toward womanhood. Some even feel that there is an "evolutionary predisposition towards chronic, intra-gender aggression" (Chesler, 2001, p. 79) among women and that this predisposition is further strengthened in more traditional, or patriarchal cultures. New York anthropologist Ilsa Glazer said, "The more subordinate women are to men and the more dependent they are in patriarchal social structures, the more injury they inflict on each other" (Chesler, 2001, p. 43).

Another factor to consider is the influence dominant females play in the development of young girls. A girl's relationship with her mother seems to be a critical component in the socialization process. In fact, some say that the self-esteem of a mother

has more influence on a girl's self-confidence than any other factor (Hales, 1999, p. 148),

thus validating the idea that powerful modeling by strong, competent women is vital in

the socialization process. Chesler (2001) promoted this notion further

> If a woman has not grown up surrounded by women leaders in the public realm
> and if she has not experienced generous, non-envious love from female relatives
> in childhood, she might have a hard time trusting any woman "in charge" to really
> know what she's doing or to exercise her authority in a fair, benevolent manner.
> This might explain why women at work have to repeatedly prove that they know
> what they're doing. (p. 358)

There are many reasons why it should matter how girls are socialized. One of the

reasons people should care about how girls are socialized is that how girls handle their

feelings and aggressions is likely to become the template for their relationships as adults

(Wiseman, 2002). It also provided necessary encouragement to believe that what was

conveyed as expectations matters and that just because it is universal and instructive,

meanness among girls does not have to be tolerated or nurtured (Simmons, 2002). The

subtle, but pervasive discrimination that girls have been socialized in can be changed so it

does not become the template for women's behavior.

Relationship Dynamics for Girls and Women

Relationships are central to a girl's social development (Coloroso, 2003;

Simmons, 2002); belonging is the most important thing to a girl (Chesler, 2001). This

desire to be engaged with others sometimes drives girls to behave in ways that appear

demeaning and lacking in morality because, according to Anne Campbell, in order to

belong, each girl "must conform to group expectations while not exceeding them"

(Chesler, 2001, p. 82). Philosopher Claudia Card has noted, "Attention is to the soul what

air, water, and food are to the body—they keep it vital; . . . invisibility produces attention

starvation" (Chesler, 2001, p. 455). Few things are more devastating to girls than

exclusion from a group activity (Wiseman, 2002). The explanation for this reality is that while boys have a tendency to define themselves through activity, girls do so more through the "context of their relationships" (Hales, 1999, p. 136). It is this attitude toward relationships that makes exclusion the most powerful of events for girls. Girls will work hard to "keep others out" (Eichenbaum & Orbach, 1987, p. 116) because they innately understand that isolation is the ultimate indirect aggression and will produce the most change in the behavior of the targeted girl. It will also allow for the most control.

Being alone "crushes" girls (Simmons, 2002). Simmons found a correlation between girls and lions: "if a female lion is alone, she dies. She has to be part of the group" (p. 32). While Simmons made comparisons to the animal kingdom, Chesler (2001) was much more direct when she stated

> Female indirect aggression can be painful psychologically, socially, and economically. Such aggression is both verbal and nonverbal and includes reputation-wrecking gossip and shunning, which may lead to social 'death' and, in some cultures, to real death as well. (p. 36)

In 1990, South Carolina anthropologist, Marjorie Harness Goodwin conducted field work which indicated that for best effect, girls will "embark upon a campaign to enlist others into their own private army of righteous indignation" (Chesler, 2001, p. 112) before they will target a girl for exile. Exclusion from a group or event is very powerful and girls learn at an early age that "there is no gesture more devastating than the back turning away" (Simmons, 2002, p. 3). Using relationships to hurt and harm other girls and women is part of the hidden culture of aggression, one of its most powerful parts (Coloroso, 2003; Simmons 2002). In fact, the isolation caused by the loss of a relationship has been likened to a sudden falling away of human society that amounts to "a loss of one's existential footing" (Chesler, 2001, p. 83). Neither age nor status seemed

to be a factor in the level of hurt and devastation caused by the withdrawal of friendship and it appeared that "even extraordinary women—*especially* extraordinary women—need each other" (Estrich, 2001, p. 46) for the support and validation found for women only in relationships.

Relationships are such a strong component of the sense of security for women that when they feel threatened they will "gravitate toward their friends" (Heim & Murphy, 2001, p. 120) to seek reassurance and support. While girls and women seem to be drawn toward each other and draw strength from their inclusion with each other, the malevolent presence of covert hostility continues to hover over them. The inability, or lack of experience, in expressing feelings and concerns in a direct way ultimately begins to "infect their relationships with each other" (Eichenbaum & Orbach, 1987, p. 120) and limits the depth of these relationships.

The same difficulties girls face present themselves again for grown women. Girls learn early that to get along and have relationships with friends they must not appear too confident or superior. In much the same way, in the workplace, horizontal violence is used on a peer or coworker in "the hope of diminishing her power" (Heim & Murphy, 2001, p. 120) by exposing her weaknesses and flaws. Women also measure themselves against their peers and oftentimes will conclude that the success of other women translates into their failure (Tanenbaum, 2002), thereby tainting a potentially collaborative and supportive relationship or removing the possibility of further cooperation entirely.

When women see other women trying to develop and enhance themselves, they are more likely to try to discourage them than to support them (Eichenbaum & Orbach,

1987). This is another facet of horizontal violence and it is best accomplished with the same quiet and covert behaviors that served women as young girls. The need to not appear superior, for fear of exclusion, keeps women from aspiring to excel. The need to have everyone appear to be equal keeps women from encouraging other women. The question that women must deal with is "Do I have enough of what you have inside of me?" (Eichenbaum & Orbach, 1987, p. 101) Another way to pose the question is: Will women be able to overcome or suspend their own feelings of inadequacy in the face of other women's superiority? Will women be able to celebrate the success of others while continuing to work on themselves?

The methods of controlling a promising young girl who may appear to be standing above the crowd are the very same methods employed by women on each other. Women, quick to believe the worst about one another, will use gossip and other means of indirect aggression to control aspiring women (Chesler, 2001). Due to this sabotage, women's work relationships with other women tend to be driven by conflict more than their relationships with men (Heim & Murphy, 2001). This behavior leads to a less friendly work environment and reduces the opportunities for supportive and collaborative work groups in the workplace of women.

A study by the American Management Association found that 950 of the 1000 women participating felt that "other women had undermined them at some time in their careers" (Heim & Murphy, 2001, p. 9). Independent of this study, authors Heim and Murphy (2001) stated that almost every participant they had encountered in their research had acknowledged that women damage other women's career aspirations and that this atmospheric erosion in the workplace had increased by 50% during the 1990s.

Relationships in the workplace are further complicated by the fact that women hold other women to a different (and higher) standard than they use for men in equal positions. Chesler (2001) maintained that women often have "unacknowledged and unrealistic expectations about how a woman professional is supposed to behave" (p. 364), as well. By holding fellow professional women to unattainable expectations, once again women sabotage the careers of competent and promising peers and also maintain the status quo by preventing female leaders from aspiring to or attaining leadership positions. This is sexism in practice (Chesler, 2001).

A further twist to consider when reviewing the dynamics of relationships among women is that as women "we come to believe that male approval is more significant than female approval, and that a relationship with a man confers more status than a relationship with a woman" (Tanenbaum, 2002, p. 48). This does little to promote developing productive work or personal relationships among female coworkers.

The Impact of Leadership on Relationships

In 1998, a study conducted by Catalyst examined the sex of those holding the top five positions in every Fortune 500 Company. They found that in the highest ranks of corporate America, only 63 women held positions compared to 2,373 men (Estrich, 2001). While this indicated that most high managerial positions continued to be held by men as recently as six years ago, an increasing number of management positions are being sought and awarded to women. As women rise to top positions in the workforce, and especially in careers that are traditionally seen as "female," they face the added difficulties of juggling promotions and the hostilities of other women as they are advanced. The relationship between women is precarious in any situation and the reality

is that women remain divided (Tanenbaum, 2002). The tenuous relationships between women are further complicated by the superior-subordinate relationship in the workplace.

Eichenbaum and Orbach (1987) found that by the mid-1980s working women were expressing frustrations about the problems they were experiencing in their relationships with other women as they aspired to higher positions and experienced success in their jobs. Female managers, especially, communicated hurt and disbelief at the way they were treated by subordinate women and said they "felt bloodied by women in lower positions" (Heim & Murphy, 2001, p. 3).

When a woman increases her influence, power, or confidence, other women may feel hurt and angry and reach out to other women for support through indirect aggression, such as gossip, in an effort to undermine the competitor's success (Heim & Murphy, 2001). Central to the issue of the jealousy and hurt expressed, and covertly manifested by the subordinate female, is the nagging realization that another woman has more power and "what's stopping me from achieving the same thing?" (Tanenbaum, 2002, p. 55) The lack of confidence and self-esteem of the subordinate is brought to light by the achievements of the other woman. This further elevates the feelings of inferiority and inequity in the mind of the subordinate. Women seem compelled to engage in covert forms of aggression when they feel that their power and self-esteem are not in balance with each other (Heim & Murphy, 2001).

As part of the nurturing nature of women, it is easy to support other members of their sex when they are experiencing difficulties and hardships. However, Eichenbaum and Orbach (1987) stated

> When a woman seems to be doing well, support may be less forthcoming and she
> may feel that she has been cast out of the company of women . . . They had

known how to support her in her weakness but they were uncertain about how to support her in her strength . . . She had shown herself to be capable and confident and separate, which they all envied and feared. (p. 96)

Many female superiors enjoy their positions and are seen by their subordinates as inspiring and encouraging. Some have enough self confidence to enjoy working under the supervision of another woman, but just as often the

> . . . inspirational aspect gives way to feelings of jealousy, of anger, of wanting what that woman has. The woman becomes the focus of enormous amounts of interest and gossip. Her private life and her work actions assume importance out of proportion with reality. A woman placed in such a position can become extremely isolated. (Eichenbaum & Orbach, 1987, p. 37)

Isolation is brought about by using the same methods socialized into girls at a young age, but honed into powerful weapons by the age and advanced levels of intellect and sophistication by the subordinate women in the workplace. Not only do women fail to support competent female superiors, they seek ways to undermine their authority and credibility (Heim & Murphy, 2001) and they use the social friendships found in the workplace to isolate, hurt, and shame their female superiors (Chesler, 2001).

The horizontal violence employed by subordinates in the workplace is most generally, a reaction to the fear and envy experienced as a female superior grows in stature and self-confidence. When the other woman is left behind with the crumpled dreams of a position they themselves aspired to but couldn't imagine achieving, the jealous feelings within demand an external manifestation (Eichenbaum & Orbach, 1987). Unfortunately,

> Instead of being proud and positive about their colleague, they felt inadequate, depressed and resentful. Her success brought them in contact with their own ambitions and longings: longings for recognition, for self-confidence, for the independent identity that is still so new for women today. (Eichenbaum & Orbach, 1987, p. 98)

There is a direct link between the feelings of these adult women and the feelings of the young girls left out of an adolescent event by the popular clique of girls in junior high. Oftentimes, the same method of retaliation is considered and employed to communicate displeasure that one of the group would dare to dream bigger dreams and reach for loftier positions: lop off the head of the tall poppy.

According to Nietzsche, jealousy and resentment occur when a person lacks value, wants to be the person who possesses it, and then seeks to undermine the person who has it. It is part of a "slave morality of the weak, who don't like themselves and attempt to bring down the strong" (Tanenbaum, 2002, p.55). It is this same mentality that led to its being named the tall poppy syndrome and one that continues to find victims today.

Psychologist Gloria Cowan has studied woman's hostility to women for many years. Her data indicated that women who harbor feelings of hostility toward other women do not feel good about themselves, have lower self-esteem, positivity, and satisfaction with life, in general, compared to women who are not hostile toward women (Chesler, 2001). It is these feelings of insecurity that motivate subordinates to engage in horizontal violence as a way to make themselves feel more powerful (Tanenbaum, 2002). They feel so bad about themselves and what they perceive as the imbalance of power and influence that they will try to make themselves feel better at the expense of the successful superior (Eichenbaum & Orbach, 1987).

An assertive and successful woman is viewed as bitchy and non-maternal (Chesler, 2001) or as "too Hillary" (Estrich, 2001), when in fact she is trying to do her

job well. "The fact that she might be trying to do her job well is precisely what other women may hold against her" (Chesler, 2001, p. 346).

In light of the tremendous influence relationships and the need for inclusion have on women, it is easy to conclude that the more power a woman has, the more threatening she becomes to other women (Tanenbaum, 2002). This would have a definite impact on women as they emerge from the ranks as leaders. They would need to possess a great degree of confidence, self-esteem, and autonomy. If they are going to effectively lead other women they may also have to develop survival strategies in the face of the professional jealousy which may spawn horizontal violence among female subordinates.

I think metaphorically of qualitative research as an intricate fabric composed of minute threads, many colors, different textures, and various blends of material. This fabric is not explained easily or simply.

John Creswell

Chapter Three

Methodology: Qualitative Research

Assumptions of the Qualitative Research Design

Qualitative research uses a naturalistic, interpretive methodology to explore a social or human phenomenon (Creswell, 1998). Using interviews, observations, and documentation, the researcher paints a rich picture using a narrative approach to present the findings.

Qualitative research is conducted in the natural setting of the phenomenon being studied. In this field-focused form of study, the researcher becomes the key instrument of data collection. While studying a subject in the field, the researcher relies on three forms of information gathering: interviewing participants, observing participant behavior, and documenting anything else that gives insight into the phenomenon being studied. The researcher aims to use a flexible, evolving research design to describe the layered realties of the topic under study: horizontal violence. Because qualitative research focuses on multiple aspects of the phenomenon, it builds a three-dimensional picture of the topic under consideration.

Qualitative research focuses on processes rather than a final product, on participants' perspectives, use of expressive language to paint the picture, and persuasion through rich, thick-textured narration. These features of qualitative research promote a flexible and evolving methodology even as a person focuses on a single human or social

phenomenon. Overall, qualitative research captures a unique and revealing interpretation of a phenomenon (Miller, 2001).

The **rationale**: this study of female administrators' perceptions and experiences with horizontal violence lent itself to a narrative, naturalistic methodology. Data collection consisted of semi-structured interviews with female administrators representing diverse educational, geographic, and administrative backgrounds. The researcher, as primary data collection agent, conducted face-to-face interviews as well as follow-up contacts by telephone or e-mail transmissions with selected individuals. The diversity in academic and professional backgrounds of participants was intentional so as to give added weight to the validity of the results.

Through interviews, the researcher was able to identify multidimensional themes not usually found in standard quantitative surveys, whose information is usually quite one-dimensional and which give little opportunity to pick up on emotional response. Drawing on the rich traditions of qualitative methodologies, the researcher mined the interview transcripts for common themes. Employing this approach to data collected the researcher was able to elicit a more complete picture of the participants' experiences of horizontal violence. It was found that the qualitative approach to this study yielded far richer information than that often found in traditional survey approaches.

As with any study, the self-constructed lenses of the researcher, of participants, and of readers will filter the information. The bias of the researcher was present in the framing of the interview protocol, in the formulation of the research questions, and in the interview process itself. The participants brought personal biases as a result of life experiences. The readers' biases will depend upon their personal backgrounds, previous

experiences of the phenomenon, and understanding of the ramifications of indirect aggression among women in the educational workplace.

Aware of these filtering lenses, and despite them, the researcher found qualitative research especially appropriate for this particular study because it allowed the researcher to identify emerging themes from participants' own words. The themes were further classified into sub-themes that aided in the formulation of results into a narrative that conserved the gripping immediacy of the interviews.

<div align="center">

Tradition: Multiple Case Research Design

</div>

Assumptions of the Multiple Case Research Design

The tradition of inquiry chosen was a multiple case study, also called a collective case study. Berg (1998) defined case study in the tradition of qualitative inquiry as the systematic gathering of data about a person, social setting, or event as to permit the researcher to understand how it (the person, social setting, or event) operates. A case study explores a bounded system of situations over time using detailed data collection methods such as multiple interviews and other substantive sources of information (Creswell, 1998). A bounded system is a person or event constrained by time or place that allows study of a self-contained case. Were the phenomenon being studied not well bounded, it would be nearly impossible to approach the phenomenon as an object of research.

Furthermore, the multiple or collective case study approach with its multiple sources of information, yielded thick, rich detail on the phenomenon under consideration. Some of the substantive sources included observations, field notes, and personal documentation that supported what was observed and transcribed. By using a wide array

of data in this multiple case study, the researcher assured that the bounded system being studied was well defined and had the potential for a more complete and complex investigation. Use of the multiple case study tradition was appropriate for this study because the criteria being sought represented a well-bounded system. The criteria were four:

1. The participant was female.

2. The participant was a practicing administrator in a Midwestern state.

3. The participant had been at her present leadership level (principal, assistant principal, superintendent, or other administrative position) less than eight years.

4. The participant had experienced some level of difficulty or negativity with other women (peers or subordinates) as she had advanced into her present level of leadership.

This study was also bounded by constraints placed upon the researcher, such as self-imposed deadlines relative to graduation and degree completion.

Role of the Researcher

The researcher pursued the compilation of a pool of potential participants, set up interviews, interviewed, transcribed interviews, and identified emerging themes prior to publishing results of the study. It was the sole responsibility of the researcher to secure all tapes, transcriptions and notes during the duration of the study and to properly destroy all evidences at the completion of the study.

Critical to the reliability of the study was the researcher's ability to maintain an unbiased approach to the study, regardless of personal connectedness to and ongoing interest in the topic. Paramount to this process was an understanding of the existing

biases of the researcher and developing strategies to address those. The researcher is a female administrator who has been at her present administrative position less than eight years and has experienced horizontal violence as she has advanced within the ranks of educational leadership. The researcher held several assumptions or beliefs about horizontal violence prior to conducting the research. Among those assumptions:

1. Horizontal violence was real.

2. Most female leaders have been victimized, to some degree, by horizontal violence in their career.

3. Horizontal violence was a product of socialized behavior in young girls.

4. The legacy of horizontal violence was long-term and would not be changed without specific efforts to change attitudes about female socialization.

5. Horizontal violence minimized the effectiveness of female leaders.

6. It was difficult to affect change in an environment wrought with horizontal violence.

7. Perpetrators of horizontal violence struggled with power and control issues and these issues were manifested in sabotaging behaviors.

The fact that there were so many names for the phenomenon was surprising but the researcher believed that horizontal violence was real and certainly existed in the educational realm for female leaders. The overwhelming volume of literature on horizontal violence, in spite of the fact that it was a recently named phenomenon, was unforeseen. However, there was little room for doubt after reading the available literature that it was authentic.

Based on personal experiences with horizontal violence, the researcher believed that other female leaders had most likely been victimized at some point in their careers, as well. Drawing parallels to the behaviors evidenced in the nursing profession, and being aware that both career paths draw a similar profile of care giving personality types, it seemed obvious that similar behaviors would be evident in women in education. As the researcher studied the listing of behaviors of young girls in the literature, she drew on her own experiences with the phenomenon as a girl, her experiences with girls as an educator, and her experience with her own daughters. In all cases there was strong evidence that girls engaged in the behaviors they were allowed to engage in and that they saw modeled. When confronted they were quick to become more covert in use of those behaviors in the future. The researcher held a firm belief that horizontal violence was allowed, encouraged and modeled in many families and by peers. Because this behavior was socialized, the researcher believed that it could be trained out of young girls and women, as well. Conscious efforts would have to be made over generations and society would need to send different messages to girls about what would be accepted and what would not be tolerated. The tide of the generational perpetuation of horizontal violence could not be stemmed without specific efforts to redesign how girls are shown to interact with and empower each other. This would not be easy work. This would not be work that demonstrated immediate change. Just as it has taken many generations to "wire" girls in the use of these behaviors, it would take many generations to extinguish these behaviors.

Another assumption held by the researcher was that the presence of horizontal violence minimized the effectiveness of female leaders in most environments. If other women were expending mass amounts of energy and time to undermine and sabotage the

female leader, it was much more difficult to affect change, have a positive impact on others, and maintain an optimistic attitude in the work place. A leader's effectiveness, and ability to make and sustain change was impacted by the cooperation or lack of cooperation by subordinates. When a female leader's progress was impeded by sabotage it was difficult to make the desired positive impact.

Personal experiences with horizontal violence also led the researcher to believe that women who engaged in these behaviors were looking for ways to exert their control over others. It seemed that women who resorted to horizontal violence did so out of a need for power and was a direct result of their own struggles with low personal esteem. When they lacked control in other aspects of their life, they looked for it at their place of work and among their co-workers or superiors. They seemed to think that a show of power would elevate their status among their peers

An awareness of the aforementioned predispositions prior to the interviews was critical in the process of maintaining an objective view. To limit bias in the study the researcher closely adhered to all the stated delimitations and was ever conscious of the potential limitations. She carefully scrutinized the transcribed interviews and gave all participants the opportunity to review their transcripts. A formal audit was also conducted to examine the trustworthiness of the product and the research process itself. Furthermore, adhering closely to the pre-approved interview questions increased the researcher's objectivity during the interview process.

Having clarified the researcher's entering beliefs and biases, during this study every effort was made to bracket these biases in order to accurately represent participants' realities, to categorize statements according to the emerging themes and

avoid transference of personal experiences to the participants' narratives. Strict adherence to interview protocol was maintained at all times during the process. In addition, a number of verification strategies were used to authenticate the trustworthiness of the conclusions.

Sampling

For this study, the sampling method was "purposeful" (Creswell, 1994). In a purposeful sample, information-rich participants are chosen specifically because of the depth of knowledge or experience they bring to the study of the phenomenon. The participants in this study were drawn from a group of volunteers who fit the descriptors outlined above. Not only were potential participants screened through these criteria, but they were also selected so as to best represent diverse educational, geographic, and administrative backgrounds.

To identify the pool of participants the researcher invited volunteers through an initial letter (Appendix A) sent to all female administrators with eight or less years in their present position who were members of the state council of school administrators. All administrative positions were included in the original listing: directors, service unit administrators, coordinators, central office positions, assistants and principals. A total of 313 names were included in the original contact report. Elementary administrators working in the same district as the researcher, coordinators, and non-school directors were eliminated for the purpose of this study. Subsequently, probe letters were emailed to the remaining 286 members listed in the report. Ten letters were returned as undeliverable. E-mails were received from two women who had not been on the original contact list. A friend or relative had forwarded the information to them and they

responded because they felt very strongly about the necessity and value of the study. Over the next three weeks, potential participants responded to the probe letters expressing interest, requesting specific details, indicating inability to participate, or encouraging the researcher. During this time period a total of twenty-three women replied indicating interest in participating in the study.

In an effort to keep the study manageable, only ten participants were selected from the pool of interested women. Participants were chosen from the pool based on meeting the criteria, expressing high interest and excitement for the study, indications of multiple experiences with the phenomenon to be studied, geographic area, and years of experience in education. Interviews were set up and conducted during the early weeks of June 2004. After the initial interviews were conducted, one participant requested to be removed from the study due to fears related to discovery and concerns about anonymity. Another participant was selected from the pool of interested candidates to be interviewed in an effort to keep the number of participants at ten. Over the next month, an additional 11 women contacted the researcher and indicated a desire to be included in the study on horizontal violence. They all received notices of gratitude and were informed that the study was concluded. Overall, a total of 34 women replied indicating interest in participating in the study. The purposeful sampling yielded rich interviews and details to support the information exposed through the literature review.

Women who participated in the study were assigned pseudonyms at the time of their interviews. These were the assigned names: Peg, Sara, Julia, Rachel, Suzi, Mari, Tara, Robin, Wendy, and Rebecca. Table 1 gives a demographic profile of the ten.

Table 1.

Demographic Profile of Participants

Names (Pseudonyms)	Age (Range)	Years in Education (Range)	Years in Admin (Range)	Present Position	# Of female subordinates
Peg	30-39	10-19	0-9	Principal	35
Sara	50-59	30-39	0-9	Asst. Prin	41
Julia	40-49	10-19	0-9	Cen.Office	NA
Rachel	50-59	20-29	10-19	Principal	38
Suzi	30-39	10-19	0-9	Principal	25
Mari	50-59	20-29	10-19	Cen.Office	NA
Tara	60-69	30-39	10-19	Cen.Office	NA
Robin	50-59	10-19	0-9	Cen.Office	NA
Wendy	50-59	30-39	20-29	Principal	48
Rebecca	40-49	20-29	10-19	Principal	56

The sample of ten practicing administrators participating in the study represented a spectrum of administrative positions from principal to assistant principal to central office personnel: Four represented central office positions, one was an assistant principal, and the remaining five were principals. The average age of the participants was 49.9 years; the median age, 51. The difference in age from the youngest participant to the oldest participant was 30 years. The average number of years in education was 23.3, with a median of 22 years. The variation in years of experience was 26. Participants averaged just over 11 years of administrative experience, with a median of nine years. The variation in years of administrative experience was 23 years. These data demonstrate that the participants represented a wide-range of age, educational experience and administrative experience.

At the time of the interviews, all participants held a minimum of a Master's Degree, two had a Doctorate, and several were presently working on a Specialist Degree or Doctorate. Non-central office administrators had an average of 40.5 female subordinates. This purposeful sampling yielded rich interviews and details to support the information exposed through the literature review.

Data Collection

The researcher chose the face-to-face interview as the primary means of data collection because of the potential for layers of useful information. Strengths of the interview as a data collection technique are many and varied (Marshall & Rossman, 1989):

- to obtain large amounts of expansive and contextual data quickly;

- to facilitate cooperation from research participants;

- to facilitate access for immediate follow-up data collection for clarification or omissions;

- to aid in discovering complex interconnections in social relationships;

- to obtain data on nonverbal behaviors;

- to facilitate analysis, validity checks, and triangulation;

- to provide background context for more focus on behaviors; and

- to uncover the subjective side of the issue under study.

The interviews conducted soon after the selection of the identified participants, ranged in length from 60 minutes to 100 minutes (average 80 minutes). Both researcher and participants were aware that additional interviews could be conducted when further

probing of issues surfaced regarding horizontal violence. Interviews took place in venues

that responded to participants' comfort, needs, and site availability.

The interview protocol (Appendix B) consisted of nine carefully designed probes

to support the "grand tour" question and to "tease" relevant information out of the

experiences of the participants. The interviews were recorded using standard tape

recording devices. Interviews were transcribed verbatim in order to obtain the most

accurate quotes and information; transcripts averaged 18.5 pages per participant. The

longest transcript was that of Rachel, the shortest that of Robin (see Table 2).

Table 2.

Length of transcribed interviews

Name	Peg	Sara	Julia	Rachel	Suzi	Mari	Tara	Robin	Wendy	Rebecca
Pages	16	19	18	26	22	20	22	14	21	20

Data Analysis

Qualitative data are analyzed in what Creswell (1998) characterized as a circular

methodology. Data were sifted to obtain rich and deeply textured information. In

qualitative data analysis, the researcher reflects on the data and appraises meaning as it is

found in the context of the interview questions. Data obtained from interviews,

observations, and documentation were read, reread, and assessed so the researcher could

reach a point of deep familiarity with participants' emotions, perceptions, experiences,

and attitudes. Next, the narrative data from transcripts, observation notes, and

documentation were broken down into thematic units.

Thus, this study involved "decontextualizing" data and then "recontextualizing"

the information, as it was relevant to the research topic (Tesch, 1990). Decontextualizing

entailed breaking the data into usable chunks, each with unique properties. As these chunks were further analyzed, they were then recontextualized into sets of common themes.

In summary, the data obtained from the participants were analyzed on several occasions. A first level of analysis by the researcher took place via field notes made directly onto the interview instrument. The researcher later transcribed the interviews. After reading and proofing the transcripts, the researcher coded them in an attempt to identify the perspectives of the participants, strategies employed, difficulties and challenges met, and struggles undergone as they experienced horizontal violence in their climb up the ladder of educational leadership. There were four levels of codification utilized in the mining process. Initially, the researcher highlighted text to identify interesting and relevant information in the transcript. Next, notations were made in the margin in an effort to start identifying reoccurring themes. Eventually, the researcher differentiated the data using a numerical codification system that yielded eleven categories. With primary themes identified the researcher returned to the transcripts to mine them for additional information which separated these dominant themes but which was overlooked or categorized earlier under a peripheral code. Finally, an alphabetical code was used to group the emerging themes into four general categories.

During the coding process the dominant themes emerged: power, jealousy, differences between males and females, isolation, hurt, socialization, manipulation, concrete behaviors employed, and lack of respect. These themes were then coded or grouped into four categories: (a) antecedents, (b) behaviors, (c) consequences, and (c) desired outcomes. (a) Antecedents included the behaviors or attitudes that likely

preceded or caused the horizontal violence. Themes that were placed under this category were socialization, power needs, jealousy, fear, differences in the sexes, and perceptions about others. A subcategory was created as the socialization of administrators also needed to be considered as a possible precursor of horizontal violence. (b) The category labeled behaviors included specific behaviors, lack of respect, manipulation and use of feminine wiles. (c) Consequences were also divided into two groups since not all data coded here were negative. Negative consequences included isolation, loneliness, hurt, risk, self-doubt, betrayal, and the internalization of attacks. The positive results of horizontal violence: increased determination, overcompensated energy put into projects, renewed confidence, deepened reflection, and added sensitivity to staff members. (d) The fourth category was desired outcomes. This codification group included the strategies used and advice given to deal with and overcome horizontal violence. The process was, as Creswell (1998) would call it, the circular methodology in action.

Open coding was used during the final analysis of all the documentation and was catalogued as the emerging themes begin to take shape. The researcher called upon the expertise of another professional to review the codification and to audit the research trail. (Appendix C: External Audit Attestation) This additional layer of verification was intended to maximize confidence that relevant data had been identified and properly interpreted. The coding, now double-checked, meant that data could be reliably categorized and assigned to the principal themes that had surfaced.

Verification Strategies

Whereas quantitative research hinges on replication of results in multiple studies, qualitative research focuses on human or social phenomena where replication is not

essential, and in most cases is even impossible. Since verification cannot be done via replication, qualitative research utilizes verification strategies of internal validity, external validity, and reliability.

Internal validity is seen as the extent to which the research will seem to mirror reality (Miller, 2001). Researchers use internal validity to demonstrate efforts made to adequately represent reality and to interpret it with credibility. As a result, findings can be applied in a cautious manner to similar situations outside the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Some strategies for achieving internal validity are triangulation, member checks, peer examination, long-term or repeated observations, clarification of researcher bias, and a participatory model of research. This researcher employed the strategies of triangulation, interviews, participant review of transcripts, participant review of findings, as well as clarification of personal bias.

One form of **triangulation** is the process of using multiple sources and contacts. In this study, the researcher used multiple sources and member checks in the effort to effect triangulation. Member checks allowed an opportunity for the researcher to engage in further discussion with the participants to verify accuracy and clarify participants' intent.

External validity addresses the extent to which the study's findings can be applied to similar phenomena. A study's applicability relates to the transferability of its findings to other situations. The key to achieving external validity is to provide sufficient details within the study narrative to validate the findings for individual readers. The depth of narrative assures subsequent readers, each with his or her own unique experiences, that the findings accurately depict the phenomenon being studied and thus can be effectively

transferred to similar cases and situations (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Care was taken by the

researcher to give the participants a voice (see Chapter 4) and provide ample

contextualization beforehand. It soon became clear that these were not isolated cases. The

results, therefore, acquire greater cogency as to their transferability.

Finally, **reliability** in quantitative research hinges on whether or not a study can

be replicated. As previously stated, it is difficult to replicate qualitative research because

of the human and thus one-time nature of the events as well as the inductive nature of the

process. Instead of reliability, Lincoln and Guba (1985) preferred "dependability" and

"consistency" of the study's results. A portion of this dependability emerges from a clear

and consistent audit trail of the research as well as a formal external audit. (Appendix C:

External Audit Attestation) If a reader so chooses, he or she should be able to follow the

researcher's thought process as she moved from framing the question(s) to collecting and

analyzing the data and then compiling the study findings. A clear audit trail acts as a form

of reassurance to readers and other researchers that the study is valid and reliable to the

extent that qualitative research can be called reliable. The methodology laid out in this

chapter and the next address this area in depth.

Ethical Considerations

A primary ethical concern in this, or any, qualitative study was the anonymity of

the participants. It was imperative that the researcher exhaust every possible effort to

maintain the participants' comfort with the study and to demonstrate that participants'

views would be taken seriously at all junctures.

The first step utilized to address the ethical concerns of anonymity was to assign

each participant a pseudonym. The pseudonym was used in every aspect of the study

including transcripts, coding, and the findings portion. Additionally, no identifying factors of their school district were shared in the findings. Each participant was clearly informed, in the initial consent letter and verbally at the onset of the interview, that the conversations would be taped and later transcribed verbatim. They were also informed that quotes lifted from the transcripts would only be identified in the study via a pseudonym.

Anonymity aside, participants' comfort with the research method was of extreme importance to the researcher. Prior to each interview, participants were told that participation in the study was purely voluntary and they could withdraw from the research project at any point. Participants received and signed a written consent form (Appendix D: Written Consent Form) that specified the details for anonymity and withdrawal. Prior to the formal interview, participants were also verbally informed of their rights as participants in a study (Appendix B: Interview protocol). Each of the ten women was made aware of her status as a participant who was interviewed to identify perceptions and experiences with horizontal violence in her professional career as a school leader. These preliminaries were critical to maintaining an open line of communication between the researcher and the participants and ensured the participants' full understanding of their role in the study.

Furthermore, reciprocity was operationalized with every participant. That is, each was assured access to the study's findings in an effort to learn more about themselves and others as they related to the research questions under investigation. The primary forms of reciprocity employed were ongoing discussion regarding transcripts,

right of review, and a promised copy of the final research report as it was presented to the

dissertation committee at the conclusion of the study.

So High Above the Crowd

She was a tall poppy with eyes clear and head high.
She was really something to behold;
Confident, smart, articulate and fun.
It was easy to see why she stood so high above the crowd.

She was a tall poppy with sparkle and shine
She was sister, wife, parent, and teacher.
Some who stood near were better and more
As they drew on her strength and passion and pride.

She was a tall poppy with equal parts humor and depth.
She got our attention through her walk, her talk, and her touch.
She pounded the stake and demanded full effort.
It was easy to see why she stood so high above the crowd.

She was a tall poppy, and some despised her
Because she expected full return on every investment.
The surprise and hurt was there on her face for all to see
When her sisters mowed her down with spite and mediocrity.

She was a tall poppy, believing each woman a journey's companion.
No time or attention was spent on wonderings and why.
They looked for chinks in her armor working to destroy her with lies.
It was easy to target her, standing so high above the crowd.

She was a tall poppy, but now she's gone.
"It worked, it worked," they smugly sigh and cast about
To see if there is another who needs to be put in her place,
Instead of standing so high above the crowd.
.
She was a tall poppy and that made her easy to see.
Some sisters feel better now that the standard is dimmed.
Yes, they brought her down with jealousy and hate
But no one saw the small bit of light that took root in *my* heart.

Oh look! Here's another poppy
Growing fresh and strong and sure and tall!
I'll really be something waving in the sun as a statement to all.
I'll be easy to spot standing that way; so high above the crowd.

Midge Odermann Mougey (2004)

"The highest nail gets the hammer."

<div align="right">Russian Proverb</div>

. . . Being a principal is a tough job and it's a lonely job, but [experiences with horizontal violence] really made me look at, "Is this what I want to do? Is this what I want to put my family through at home?" . . . And, thank God, I've got a wonderful husband, and great kids who are supportive. But it really did make me wonder whether this was the career that I wanted. Basically, I decided this is what needs to be done for kids; so therefore, I had to grow through that.   "Rebecca"

Chapter Four

Introduction

The information in this study offered a firsthand view of the experiences, perceptions, and personal pain of women in professional ranks who have dealt head-on with the realities of horizontal violence. Most importantly, it revealed the resilience of women in imperfect, professional situations dealing with tremendous personal pain and hurt.

Participants shared honestly and allowed the researcher to probe deeply in the initial interview and follow-up conversations. Several of the women claimed that the interview process was "cathartic" and helpful in retrospect, but Rachel said, "I think I feel worse because the questions [caused me] to think and reflect and review on how awful some of this has really been." Words used by the participants to describe their experiences varied in intensity but all agreed that horizontal violence was a reality in the lives of female leaders and had a negative impact on the effectiveness of their leadership. Descriptions included words or phrases such as "living hell," "torturously mean," "mendacious spirit," "subversive," "insidious," "blatant," "year from hell," "crushed me," "deviant viciousness," and "grueling, grueling year."

The emotion present as the women shared their stories was evident in their words, their tone, and the details provided. Mari said, "I'm just plain pissed about it!" while Rachel offered, "It takes all my emotional energy to try to figure out what to do next. I'm mad as hell and I'm not taking it anymore!" Peg stated, "My first two years [the] majority of the evenings when I was home I would just cry and cry and cry." Rebecca offered, "My second year here was a year from hell! It really made me wonder whether I wanted to do this for a living." Sara remarked, "People were just waiting and watching for me to make a mistake. It made me question myself basically as a person. And then it also made me question myself as an administrator." When asked if "victimizing" was too strong of a word, one of the participants said, "No, it's not too strong of a word. I think that word is probably very appropriate." Rachel said, "[I]t's really too sick. She wants to be the boss, and she wants to get into my head, and I know this sounds paranoid." Wendy stated, "I think as I've gotten older, I've just gotten to understand that there are those [women] out in the world and, even though it's hurtful, I recover from it quicker and [am] able to not take it so personally." Julia pinpointed the hurtfulness in one situation when she talked about things "that bleed over on my family." When questioned about the kinds of things that have happened to put that tone into her voice she added:

There are questions about what kind of man might be married to me . . . wonder what [I am] like at home. Wondering if I wear the pants in the family. If I have full control at home like I appear to have at work. That creates a dynamic between a couple that puts greater pressure on a relationship.

There was an overall response of astonishment or ignorance from men about the existence of the phenomenon. Two of the participants commented on the reaction toward

horizontal violence by subordinate males in their buildings. Both women shared that the men had vehement and negative attitudes toward the behaviors exhibited by some of the subordinate women. Sara indicated that men in her building said, "I can't believe that this is happening. Oh my gosh, you've got better things to do than to bitch about this!" while a man in Rachel's school said, "I'm sick of this! They're just liars. I can't stand to watch it!" Rebecca said, "My husband is an unbelievable support but I don't think he understands. He hears as I talk about different things [but] kind of looks at [me] like, 'You've got to be kidding!'" Another perspective was raised by Rebecca when she asserted that the men in the central office were unable to fully comprehend the impact that horizontal violence has on female leaders: "I don't think that they can truly understand those spiteful, nasty things that [women] can do to you that they wouldn't [do] to a man."

Five of the participants made a point to call the behaviors exhibited by female subordinates "childish," "immature," or "junior high-ish." Robin said, "It just isn't very adult. More acting like kids." Mari stated, "Women don't forget" and would "act very immaturely." When describing behaviors, Peg stated, "My comparison is to middle level students and a lot of the same things that I saw. A lot of the issues that we had were the exact same thing happening with kids. Exactly!" Motivation for horizontal violence in female subordinates, in Julia's words, ". . . goes back to the junior high girls snubbing one another. Behaviors that they have not outgrown."

Findings of the Research

The data collected in the interviews were, as indicated in Chapter 3, codified into categories and themes. The following table illustrates the division of categories with the

appropriate themes. Supporting statements, participants' responses, and dialogue were
used to further develop each theme and to best showcase the stories of each of the
participants under the different category headings.

Table 3.

Categories and Themes in Data Analysis

Category	Theme
1. Antecedents	• Socialization of participants • Socialization of subordinates • Power needs • Jealousy/fear • Differences in males and females • Perceptions • "Settling"
2. Behaviors	• Lack of respect • Using feminine wiles/manipulation • Specific behaviors in interview
3. Consequences • Negative	• Isolation/loneliness • Hurt
• Positive	• Increased determination • Renewed confidence • Extra energy put into projects • Deepened reflection • Added sensitivity to staff
4. Desired Outcomes	• Strategies shared • Advice

Category 1: Antecedents to horizontal violence

The critical question continued to be "What led women to engage in these
'immature,' 'junior-high' behaviors?" According to the participants in this study, the
antecedents to these behaviors were many and varied. Among the reasons provided were

lack of power, desire for power, jealousy, fear, perceptions of how life should be, socialization, and the difference between male and female motives. Another consideration, or subcategory, was the socialization of the particular participant and how her own behaviors may have generated specific responses. It is this socialization we will seek to first understand.

Socialization of Participants

Suzi was hard working, motivated and intrinsically driven to go after the things she wanted in life. She said that her father was a huge influence in her life and that much of her philosophy reflected ideals and values modeled by her father in her formative years. She stated:

I think from the moment you are arriving on this earth you are being shaped and molded and your framework and your lens for how you view life and how you think about yourself are being shaped. Some, as [they] grow up, are more encouraged and try and do and risk and fail, and try again than others are. My dad said, "If you're going to do something, do it right." Another of his favorite sayings was, "If you throw enough mud at the wheel, some of it's bound to stick." And so it was ok to keep slinging mud and I guess I saw him model that for me. He lived what he said.

The "mud" Suzi referred to was her father's work ethic, tenacity, pride, and the ability to sustain his farm in sound financial condition despite the eroding agriculture economy of the time. Lessons learned at his knee continued to shape and drive her life choices. She declared a strong, internal sense of a true vocation to the principalship when she reported:

I truly felt called to this profession. All the way along I cultivated what I needed to do to get where I wanted to go. I don't know that everybody has a clear direction, or that they know clearly what they want to do. I could have stayed in the classroom forever. It would have been much easier to do that than it was to go to class on Monday nights or to sit until midnight working on a paper but I knew that's what I had to do to get what I wanted.

Peg was influenced by a strong mother, "I didn't have anyone other than my mother as my role model and she was always saying, 'If you disagree, tell me why. We'll talk about it.'" Her father, though not as respected an influence, was socializing her in similar ways, "My dad always did tell me that if you don't like something then you need to say it. And basically his comment to that was, 'Don't take shit off of anyone.'" Robin indicated similar sentiments about her mother's influence, "My mother always expressed how she felt and I've had to almost suppress some of that because she was too forthright." She went on to say, "I was brought up to be self-confident and so my upbringing and support there has been positive."

The effect of Rebecca's socialization by a "chauvinist" father was that she "turned out to be independent. Maybe it was to spite him." Her strength rang true throughout the course of her interview when she stated, "I think it has to do with personality, your leadership style, and who you are." Rachel's style was to be a bit subtler:

I'm too nice and too accommodating and that's really come to light for me. My nature is to try to understand [horizontal violence] and work with people and to get through it. I think I came in very naively assuming because I always have the best interest of kids at heart, and I always felt it was a very serious profession, I really expected everybody to just do what was right.

Wendy stated that she felt a lot of the horizontal violence she had seen had to do with the differences between males and females:

You know I think I'm kind of a different female. I really function this way, the way I functioned most of my life, because my father died when I was [young] so women in

my life were very strong women. And throughout my career my perception of women

is that they're a lot like that and it surprises me every time I find women who aren't

like that. [Women] who use their feminine wiles to get their way, and do what they

want to do. It always surprises me. When I was younger it used to be very frustrating

to me because I always thought women a bit more than that, but then I understand,

too that they were a product of how they were raised.

Tara's early socialization led her to believe that the boss was worthy of

compliance and respect. She said, "When I first started I thought people [did] what the

boss wanted and didn't give [the boss] any problems"; and "I was brought up that you

have a job to do. Do it to the best of your ability, whether it's a male or a female that

you're working with and then move on."

Socialization of "Zero Sum" Mentality in Subordinates

The socialization of these ten women, and the socialization of women in general,

were seen by all participants as a significant factor in contributing to the perpetuation of

horizontal violence among women. Very prevalent among the participants was a

perception that women worked from a "zero sum" mentality, that is, a gain by one person

entails a corresponding loss by another. It is a mind-set that posits limited opportunities

and resources available to women and assumes that when two women are in a

work/personal relationship, one getting something means the other gets less (or loses!).

This mentality has worked to further diminish the effectiveness not only of female

leaders, but all women. Julia related:

I think there's such a fear of loss, such an attitude of scarcity rather than having

resources expand or good will expand to be sufficient for everybody. If I'm gaining

more approval, they will have less approval or less accolades, or less attention. I'm good if I prove to be more knowledgeable about something.

Sara echoed this sentiment when she stated:

If they could knock me down and make me feel weaker then it would give them a greater sense of power and strength. They were trying to tell me, "Even though you are in a position of power, you are not going to be more powerful than I am. We will make sure that you understand that you don't have power over us." It's like I need to blow out your candle so mine'll burn a bit brighter.

So did Tara:

I think [horizontal violence] is a betrayal. You would think that we would help each other rather than kill each other. We need to have ways to be together, to talk about some of those issues and to work through them and to support [women] that are trying to do that.

Robin heard an illustrative example of this "zero sum" mentality from a woman who described her frustration with the attitudes of people within her minority culture: "We're just like a bucket of crabs. When one of us gets ahead, the rest of us grab hold and try to pull [her] back into the bucket." Robin continued, "It's that same way with women. When one gets ahead, they try and sort of pull [her] back down so that everybody's on the same playing field." Robin felt the same frustration: "When one woman gets ahead it enhances the whole group and that [woman could] have the way then to bring the whole group along."

The flip side of the "zero sum" mentality perpetuated by women is a settling for

less than they want or are capable of achieving. The result is anger, frustration, and

jealousy shown often in quite mendacious ways toward those who have accomplished

greater goals and higher positions of influence. Several of the participants described

painful experiences about this reality. Robin, commenting on the extreme jealousy from a

subordinate who had not reached the same level of leadership in her career, said:

"[M]aybe [she] didn't make use of the advantages she had" but her behavior was "just

mainly jealousy and envy." Mari, stated, "They're very shallow. They don't have a very

good self-esteem. It's more jealousy on their part that they haven't moved on in their life

and that the successful female has been able to overcome the roadblocks." Suzi could

second that:

> Women don't like other women to get something they want. Sometimes it's
>
> discipline, sometimes it's drive, sometimes it's persistence, sometimes it's
>
> perseverance. Sometimes it's a 'settling.' There are [women] that just find it easier to
>
> settle for what they currently are or have than to take a risk, or to spend the money or
>
> to devote the time to that which they really want. They've decided to just settle where
>
> they are because it's just easier. Women sometimes will use life circumstances [as] an
>
> excuse. It's easier to keep [busy] with other things than to go after what you really
>
> want.

> Suzi had a hard time accepting this settling for less mentality in her subordinates and
> challenged one woman, "Are you scared more to do it or are you scared more to end
> this life without having done what you really feel like you wanted to do?"
>   Besides "zero sum" mentality, study participants also agreed that women

engaging in horizontal violence were doing so because they had been socialized to use

less overt methods of behavior and because they had been successful over time using those socialized methods. Tara put it succinctly: "Behaviors are learned" and women have learned, through socialization to "repeat behaviors that have worked." Peg would agree:

> I think that women don't have enough appropriate things in their arsenal of things to do. I don't know if it's the lack of confidence. They weren't strong enough to grow up to do and say [things] to your face. Women have not felt early on that they could voice their dissension, weren't given opportunities to do so and it starts early. Instead of finding appropriate ways to voice their discontent they find other ways that are less aggressive in people's minds eye.

Rachel echoed that: "They don't know how to deal directly with conflict. They get more pleasure out of stirring the pot and getting things turned up for people."

Julia stated that a principal motivation for women engaging in horizontal violence is because it has worked for them in the past: "They assume there will be a payoff. It gets them what they want. It goes back to the junior high girls' behavior that they have not outgrown." Suzi could add: "Unless a woman knows, really knows, who she is, what she's about, where she's headed, and how she's going to get there [she] is more likely to use [horizontal violence] because [of skill] gaps."

Wendy saw the low self-esteem in many female subordinates as the result of socialization, for as teenagers "they still had low self-esteem but didn't necessarily let people see that side of themselves. [It] would seem that they had everything in control. When you peel through all those layers there's something else going on." And Tara would second that:

[Horizontal violence is] learned behavior. That's what we're doing. Continually

learning from each other, and not finding ways to handle it. We internalize more; we

don't let it go as often. I say to my daughters sometimes, "We muddle in it or mire in

it, then get through it." I think a male has more tendency to get through it.

Subordinates' Attitudes About Female/Male Roles

Another aspect of socialization was the attitudes women had about men in

leadership roles and how those impacted women who chose to follow the non-traditional

path of leadership in an arena that was traditionally a male realm. The difference in

leadership styles, women's perceptions about men in positions of power, and the

socialized attitudes about power were components that surfaced frequently. Tara felt that

"men have a tendency to get their point across with more teasing and more sarcasm" than

a female would:

> [Men] would bring out the [issue] but it would be done in a playful way and the point
>
> would be made, and the barrier would be broken. Females don't do that as much. I
>
> would internalize that rather than express it.

Cultural expectations (an important element of socialization) play a big part as Robin

pointed out:

> Women are more likely to question another woman than they are a man in a superior
>
> role. They don't perceive women as having as much power so they're liable to
>
> question their judgment. I don't think men would have the same questions [put to
>
> them]. [There is] just more hesitance on their part to accept another woman could be

over them in a leadership position. They expected men to be but they didn't expect women to be.

Wendy reiterated and added a dimension consistent in the comments of several participants, when she noted that subordinate women were not above using "feminine wiles" and "manipulation" to get the things they wanted from male leaders:

Teachers were used to working for men. They didn't quite know what to make of me because when they had come in before [to the male principal] and wanted favors they thought they should be given something above someone else. That was kind of a shock to them.

Mari had a similar appraisal:

The gentleman that I replaced had learned to work with women and the way that they strategized or manipulated to get what they want. That was one of the roadblocks that I put up immediately. I wasn't going to submit to manipulation. I knew what their little games were. I could see through their plans and that was one of the things that they didn't know how to deal with.

Julia pointed to differences in communication styles:

[Female subordinates] feel freer to talk to me about things than they might feel [with] a man. Then there is an expectation that that friendliness that comes from more conversation will carry over into being more understanding, more lenient in terms of performance expectations. There is an expectation that I will back off, initially. There is an assumption by my female subordinates that they don't have to be as specific in their language because I'm a woman and I can read between the lines. So there is less precise, less clear communication sometimes . . . Women will do it and try to hide it, and cover it up, and make excuses for it. A man will just say, "Yup, I did it. What are you going to do about it?"

Rachel put it this way: "Most women wouldn't take some of these issues to a man."

Rebecca elaborated on this notion:

> Females run much more on the emotional aspect than they do with the male. They are
>
> more open with their emotions and [subordinates] use that emotion against you. They
>
> wouldn't with a male. [Subordinates] expect you to be more wishy-washy and they
>
> want you to be more wishy-washy. When men are assertive they're considered to be
>
> assertive, but when women [are assertive] you tend to be [seen as] a bitch.

She further stated that subordinates were more likely to blur the lines between a female

superior than a male counterpart because they wanted to "involve me in that cattiness"

that is seemingly central to women's behavior toward each other, for "Women can be

vicious!"

> Tara stated, "I would seldom ask a secretary to do any personal errands or make
> coffee. A male wouldn't have any problem doing that. The secretary may even
> volunteer to do that for a man." Female subordinates are more likely to use
> "sharpness in words" and "bluntness in language" with a woman, she said, because
> "they know the male is used to being in charge and is used to people doing what they
> say." Tara also illustrated another difference between the sexes when she shared,
> "[Some women] maintain a public image of being warm and friendly but in the work
> place they are not warm and friendly. I don't think men do that as much." Asked
> about the motivation for women to engage in covert, undermining behaviors, she
> stated that it is uniquely female "because men don't care that much."

Mari agreed with Robin's assessment that there was more questioning of the

authority of a female leader than that of a male. She said, "If my subordinate, who is

male, gives a directive, the response is immediate. However, if I give the same directive,

there is questioning, there's doubt, there's refusal." Mari tempered her opinions about

attitudes toward female leaders when she stated, "I believe that women administrators in

large cities are received on an equal basis. However, when you get into the rural

communities females are not to be the person in charge. They're [supposed to be] the person behind the scenes."

Wendy suggested that the reason women engaged in horizontal violence was because they were "acting out of their own fear of losing their control and power within the building. They're thinking, 'I can't manipulate this woman like I can manipulate a man.'" Additionally, she stated, "[Female subordinates] would take from a male [things] they won't take from a female." Julia further illustrated these differences: "My husband, who is in education, tells me that I am much more tolerant of behaviors that are inappropriate and are ineffective than he or his male colleagues would have been."

Another oft-repeated theme during the interviews was the preconceived or socialized attitude of male superiority or competence. Robin stated,

In all leadership positions women have to be just a little better at their job in order to get respect. Even to get the job in the first place they have to prove a little more skill, a little more qualifications. People tend to believe that women can't do the job. With men we think [they] can do the job and [they'll] have to prove [they] can't.

Wendy supported this: "Women have to prove themselves. They have to prove their competence." Tara concurred: "I see males get into leadership positions easier than females." In the midst of laughter Rebecca said, "If I want action, I'm going to go with women. If I want a group to give me the nod, I'm going to pick men."

Power Needs, Jealousy, and Perceived Threats Among Subordinates

Another precursor to horizontal violence among women appeared to be the power needs of women and the jealousy and fear they felt when those needs were not met. Many of the participants remarked about times when a woman's need for power or the feelings

of jealousy from another woman's perceived power within a school staff drove the subordinate to engage in belittling and horrific behaviors toward their superiors.

"There was surprise that I was so competent and I believe that they felt somewhat threatened by that competence," stated Julia. About a particular staff member Sara said: "[She] did not like the fact that a woman had more power than she had and she was not about to have any woman tell her what to do and she made that very clear." Sara went on to say that some women are "power hungry":

They love being in that position of power and they lord it over people. Women want to be noticed. They want to be important and many women see a position of power [as] meaning they have worth. [Their] self worth is measured by the amount of power or control they have over other people."

Sara also believed that a lot of subordinate females on her staff had not liked "to see a woman in [a power] position." Rachel found one staff member who had a strong sense of her own power within the building:

She felt like when she didn't like the way things were going she was capable of actually getting a principal removed from her position. Her perception was that she got another person fired [and it] probably gave her some importance to think that could happen again.

Rachel added that she had followed a very ineffective principal "so I had a number of women in the building who had basically assumed the leadership positions" and while

most were willing to abdicate that role in the face of an effective leader, there were two women who "were not ready to give it up." Wendy voiced a similar concern as a result of the change her leadership had brought to the building,

They're not comfortable. They've dominated the staff previously and so when [I] come in they don't have that kind of dominating role any longer; they're acting out of their own fear of losing their control and power within the building. They like the power they had in that position before. Their power and position is threatened and they start doing little things behind your back to undermine what you are trying to do.

Peg concurred that she also found women in her building that considered her intimidating and would direct vicious behaviors toward her. When Peg had confronted a teacher about some unprofessional behaviors she asked the teacher why she would say certain things in front of students. The subordinate answered, in a show of power, "Because I can!"

Suzi asserted: "If there's a perception of a bit of a threat there [that you are] going to get ahead" it could be problematic for the female leader, for these are women "who see clearly what they want and have the drive and the determination to go out there and get it. I think it's admired by some, and for others it can be a jealousy factor." Robin stated it thus: "more power, more salary, caus[ed] jealousy"; she found this carried over to other aspects of the dynamics in a school district. Julia offered the following about a subordinate who was exhibiting extreme envy: "I think there is the question of why she didn't [advance in the ranks]." Tara wondered why, "Instead of rejoicing that you're doing something good for the organization, it's played out in resentment."

Julia commented on women "who are insecure, or who feel threatened,"

especially one particular woman who took a lot of her energy:

> There is an insecurity there that I am guessing goes way back to the way that she
> grew up, the way that she was socialized. That fear pops up and if I don't give her
> the attention and the accolades and the affirmations that she needs on a very
> regular basis then I find that she's talking behind my back.

Rebecca had similar experiences with insecure women:

> It all comes down to insecurity. If I looked at them in life, they are negative in life.
> They're negative in their interactions with their own children. I don't know that it's
> specific to their career in education. It's much greater than that. They're very
> unhappy people in life.

Peg could add:

> I think they're incredibly unhappy in their personal life and unhappy in their
> professional lives and so let's make everyone else unhappy, too. It's fun to talk about
> people because it makes us forget our own problems, and woes, and worries for a
> while.

Tara saw such undermining behavior by women thus: "It represents our own insecurities"
in a world "run by males." Mari pointed out one local motivation for horizontal violence
and undermining behaviors in her experience,

> There is a sense of superiority that we're better than anyone else and we can operate
> by our own set of playing rules. It comes from the veteran teachers who have never
> taught anyplace else; those who are hometown people. They went to school here, they

graduated from here, they left long enough to get a college degree and they came

back. Now it's their school!

Category 2: Behaviors (Horizontal Violence) Observed in Subordinates

All ten members of the study had multiple experiences with horizontal violence in their careers. Some of the experiences showed more mendacity than others but all participants shared reactions of shock and often deep hurt. Many expressed that they perceived the behaviors as "personal attacks" on themselves. Rachel called horizontal violence a "poison" in her building.

Behaviors alluded to included name-calling, sabotage, belittling remarks, gossiping, rumor-mongering, and the like. The researcher had a list of specific behaviors which were included as part of the interview protocol. Participants offered anecdotal evidence for any behavior that applied to them specifically and offered examples of additional behaviors that they judged to be horizontal violence.

All ten participants experienced power issues like questioning authority and non-compliance. Other behaviors that all participants experienced, to varying degrees, were gossip, sabotage, and talking behind one's back. All but one of the respondents experienced eye rolling, poor eye contact, snubbing or overt exclusion, and felt personally attacked by the behaviors exhibited by subordinate women. Behaviors experienced to a lesser degree were name-calling (n = 7), belittling (n = 7), withholding information or affection (n = 7), taking credit or stealing ideas (n = 7), sarcasm (n = 6), pouting (n = 6), rumors (n = 6), rumors about men (n = 3), and keeping a "notebook" on the administrator (n = 2). One participant had an anonymous letter written about her and another had received a death threat following an administrative decision.

In the literature review it was uncovered that name-calling had been one of the ways that young girls controlled each other. This research supported the fact that putdowns continued to be a powerful method employed by females to exert control over

one another. Participants proffered the following (incomplete) list as names attributed to them by subordinates: bitch, clone, pushy broad, velvet hammer, airhead, fat bitch, ice princess, middle-aged white woman, and hard-nosed bitch. While the names not only showed displeasure but were meant to denigrate, humiliate, and belittle—and they certainly were an irritation and a gesture of disrespect—most participants could at this later date show humor over the names used or the fact that subordinates were going to such lengths to flex their muscles. Julia laughed as she said: "My nickname the first year was 'The Velvet Hammer' and then the second year they thought that maybe the velvet had come off. I was just 'The Hammer.'" One participant still felt deep hurt about a subordinate's comment ("What does that fat bitch know about this anyway?") made in front of a group of students. The participant's response to the researcher was "That's by far the worst that was ever said, and I haven't quite been able to put it to rest yet," indicating the long-lasting effects of horizontal violence.

All participants found themselves occasional targets of gossip though degree of viciousness varied. Many participants moved to diminish the effects of gossip for themselves and excused the behavior as "You know girls just talk," or "You can fool yourself into thinking people don't talk about you," or "Gossiping is just part of any institution." Suzi said that she had a staff member "who has a mouth that runs like a faucet" and was the "only person on my staff who drives me crazy and would cause me to fake a phone call just to get her out of my office." Tara, the most veteran of the participants, stated, "Women like the juiciness of the one-up-manship [of gossip]. Being able to tell something that somebody else doesn't know." Mari said, that in her rural community gossip was an issue, "If they have any new tidbit the whole community

would know it. And, of course, most of the time it had been embellished." Wendy was adamant that gossip was destructive and was used as a weapon by perpetrators,

Gossip is an insidious thing. Oftentimes I find that these kinds of females like to get things stirred up. They like to keep people out of balance because it's easier for them to promote themselves. They play both ends against the middle.

Peg had similar feelings about the effects of gossip. She had been the victim of gossip and rumors, "that were very hurtful, incredibly hurtful" and she took them quite personally. She felt her youth and subordinates' jealousy about her appearance had exacerbated the gossip and rumors,

The women I have worked with have been incredibly gossipy. Just bizarre things that I couldn't imagine would've happened to someone older or someone who was less Barbie-like. With me it was more personal. There were personal attacks about me or about my family. Someone even said something really horrible about my mother.

Six of the women said that they had been victimized by rumors. For three of the women there were damaging effects from the rumors and the resulting innuendoes that lasted for some time. Peg stated that others made:

. . . Insinuations [that] I was able to make something happen only because I had flirted with an individual or I had batted my eyes. The most hurtful were these innuendos that there was an inappropriate relationship with my superior. Those were the most hurtful. Hurt me, hurt my husband, hurt my family, my mother. Hurtful to all of us.

Suzi felt a similar hurt over a "comment that was made about me regarding my relationship with another administrator" that was ill founded. However, she was quite reflective in her analysis as to the motivation of the subordinates who engaged in such

behaviors, "I think some women are jealous of women who are able to have positive relationships with men and who are probably seen as threatening because of something that you may have going for you that [they do] not." Rachel, too, had lies spread at her school that she was living with a former employee. All three participants pointed out that the rumors were without foundation; the facts were that they worked closely with the men involved and were friendly, as well. Suzi, referring to her minority status in a pool of largely male administrators, added, "that's a risk you run."

Withholding information or affection was a behavior experienced by seven of the participants. Julia offered, "One of the ways in which women punish is to go silent." Women used this behavior more to make their point, she said and their thinking often went along the lines of, "If you think you're so smart, you just try to do it without the information that I know you need to have." Mari shared that while she had "a gut feeling that was happening" she could not give any specific examples. Rachel indicated that her worst perpetrators of horizontal violence did withhold affection but she quickly added, "I like it when they ignore me. I don't mind it a bit." Another twist to this behavior was the subordinate who needs coaxing to share thoughts and feelings. One of Suzi's teachers used these behaviors and forced Suzi to "have to dig to find out" what the problems were for her. The opposite viewpoint came from Rebecca: "I think it's the opposite with females. I think they give way too much information. I mean, I know specifics on things that I would really rather not know."

Sabotage was a behavior all experienced to some degree. Tara indicated that the small behaviors women engaged in to sabotage were "trying" and "trivial" but still had to be dealt with by superiors. Robin stated, "Teachers, especially elementary teachers, or

largely women will participate in [sabotage] in an effort to not make the program work."

Mari's experience was that experienced teachers often involved the novices in

inappropriate behaviors;

> I truly believe it was a veteran staff who brought the newbies under their wings and
>
> before long the veteran staff was sitting in the background and it was the new ones
>
> that would come in. It was like, "Give it to Mikey. Mikey'll do anything!" It was a
>
> handful of the old guard that just wouldn't cooperate.

She found this to be a "major attempt to keep things just status quo." A sabotaging

behavior that Mari pointed out was staff "scurrying to the board to make sure that they

knew it wouldn't work" before anyone had given the idea a chance for success. Julia's

spin on the realties of sabotage had to do with both men and women. The amount of

sabotage was not the issue for her, only the "styles of sabotage." Her experience was that

women engaged in less "direct confrontation of an idea" and more "agreeing to my face

and doing something different behind my back."

Snubbing was experienced by nine of the ten women. All of the participants,

however, qualified that the behaviors were very subtle and were more exclusionary in

nature than a malicious turning of the back. Some participants felt that the exclusion was

unintentional and the natural result of the barriers existing between superiors and

subordinates while others strongly voiced hurt and disappointment at being cut off from

the relationships in the building. All found that the exclusion caused isolation for them,

though in differing degrees. Robin noticed that she was "not included quite in the social

context" but she understood that because of her position at the negotiating table. Rebecca

expressed glee, stating, "Oh, we've got some [women] who excel at snubbing. In my

warped sense of humor I go out of my way to be excited when I see them." Mari said that there were times when she was deliberately left out of things and would be asked later, "Well, why didn't you come?" When she explained that she hadn't been invited, female subordinates were quick to say, "Oh, we didn't mean to leave you out." Sara had examples of subordinates, after she had greeted them in the hallway, who "would walk away like they had not even heard what I had said." Also, she indicated that some "would talk about [weekend social events] in front of me and they talked about all the things that they did, but they never included me." When probed about the intent of the subordinates, Sara said, "Do I think it was accidental? No! I think they knew what they were doing."

An interesting, collective response occurred when the researcher questioned participants about others stealing their professional ideas or taking credit for their ideas. Of the seven women who had experienced this, all indicated that it was not problematic for them. There was a general consensus that the female leaders were there for kids and that anything they did that contributed to making things better for the youth they served was a positive thing. The women were not as interested in getting credit for their ideas as they were in getting the ideas implemented, by whatever means that took. The attitude was very collegial and positive even though this behavior, on the part of the subordinates, was not professional. Rebecca said, "That doesn't bother me." "I'd just as soon somebody else take the credit," was Robin's response while Mari indicated, "I enjoy when somebody else takes an idea that I have planted and go ahead and develop [it]." Julia stated, "Part of my management style is to make people think that they came up with the idea themselves instead of having me plant the seed and nurturing it along the way." Age and increased wisdom were part of Wendy's response, "Years ago that might

have been a problem for me. It's not any longer. As long as something happens, I really

don't care who gets the credit for it."

Pouting was another behavior that participants commented on in their interviews.

Once again, female subordinates engaged in pouting and six of the participants shared

personal examples of pouting. Some of the pouting was accompanied by stomping off,

"temper tantrums" or quiet, shutting down. Peg remarked, "Women are excellent at

pouting. I saw that more when they just don't talk with you for a few days." Wendy said

that her subordinates pouted, "when they don't get things their way," and Suzi's

experience was that "they get over it pretty easily and usually they'll respect the

decision." Sara found that on occasion when a correction had occurred, "I would get

teachers that would not speak to me or would be immediately on the email [talking about]

how unjust [I was or] how unfair it was." Julia, on the other hand, said:

> I'm pretty tolerant of pouting because to a certain extent I see it as a way of
> reflecting, you know, backing up and reflecting. People are somewhat surprised
> sometimes that I'm tolerant and willing to allow them to have their feelings hurt.

Regardless of the aggression or lack of aggression of the behavior, study participants saw

it as generally counterproductive in the school setting, something that kept school

personnel from their defined purposes.

Some subordinates used other kinds of passive aggressive behaviors. Rachel said

that some of her teachers passed notes at faculty meetings while Sara stated that some of

her teachers used premade responses that they displayed at meetings to indicate their

reaction to the discussion being conducted. Responses included, "They're looking," and

"This is s-h-_ _."

Another behavior that proved to be hurtful and vicious was the creation and maintenance of documentation notebooks on several of the leaders. Rachel stated, "There were a few very negative people in the building really criticizing my decisions and my leadership and they had actually talked about keeping a notebook." Sara indicated that the same had been true for her,

> I was told that they were keeping a notebook on me on all the mistakes that I made. People just sitting back waiting for me to make [a mistake]. The more conscious I became of everything I did, [the] more mistakes I made. It was really, really a living hell.

Both leaders, while deeply hurt by this behavior, handled the assault with dignity and even a little humor. Sara said that eventually, "When I made a mistake I would say to them, 'Here's another one for your book. Don't forget to add it.'" The response of the subordinates to this chiding was, "Oh my God! How did you find out we were doing this?" She chuckled when she added, " [It] actually [was] one of the times they were speechless."

Category 3: Consequences of Horizontal Violence
Negative Consequences for Leaders

As targets of horizontal violence, participants all suffered negative ramifications from the behaviors of the women under them. Specifics of the behaviors aside, the real damage is that, according to Rachel, "Those [behaviors] get in the way of trying to move forward with about anything that we do."

Some of the negative effects shared were isolation, exclusion, personal self-doubt, professional self-doubt, less openness, adverse impact on family life, and loneliness. Responses were honest and often gut wrenching.

Julia shared, "I want to be liked, too. It goes back to junior high. The most cruel thing that we do to one another is isolate one another." Julia found that the realities of horizontal violence caused her to "close down" some of her natural propensity toward openness. Distress and hurt from her job added pressure on her relationship with her husband and family at times. She said she was bothered by the implication that her husband must be "weak" because she was the "pushy broad" and appeared to be in control of things. Another challenge was the perception by subordinates that she was "unfriendly when I don't accept some of these negative behaviors."

Robin experienced hurt when someone talked about her behind her back and admitted that it "bothered" her. She also talked about being excluded from social situations and being seen "as the enemy." Because she was a "loner," she admitted to being less bothered by exclusion than others but did say, "You do tend to be isolated from other women."

Rebecca reported that when she put all the realities of horizontal violence together, "It wasn't pretty!" The behaviors of a particular female subordinate she called her "greatest personal assault." These attacks caused a lot of "self-doubt" as she struggled with the maliciousness of the rumors and gossip. She asked, "Am I that mean, vicious person that lurks in the hall waiting for some teacher to come in? It really makes you think, 'Man, am I doing that?'" Further doubt led her to examine, "Is this what I want to do for the rest of my life . . . I felt very lonely in what was happening to me but not naïve enough to think it didn't happen to other people." Rebecca said that her second year was

A year from hell. If they could have, they'd have gotten rid of me. It was very

vicious. There were a lot of personal attacks on me. It really made me wonder

whether I wanted to do this for a living. Being a principal is a tough job and it's a

lonely job, but it really made me look at "Is this what I want to do?" Is it what I want

to put my family through at home?

Tara, too, experienced self-doubt. She said, "You begin to question yourself

whether it's because of your behavior." She too felt loneliness and isolation from others.

Tara wrote it off to "fear" of getting too close to subordinates and saw the isolation as

necessary to "draw those lines so finely" that separate superiors and subordinates. She

strongly affirmed that horizontal violence was a "betrayal" of women and admitted to

feelings of hurt.

Rachel felt "lots of anger and truly pain" which led to "self-doubt." She said, "I

thought I could trust these people and I really misjudged a few and it's hurt me." In fact,

on occasion she felt "violated." She said, "It's just beyond me! So I feel doubly violated

because I could see if I was a dictatorial bitch who never gave anyone an inch." Rachel

found herself starting to sound "paranoid" as she exercised extreme caution around some

subordinates. She related, "This became personal to me. It took a long time to even

accept that this was really happening." The hurt and isolation was exacerbated by the fact

that she believed that she was the only one to ever experience horizontal violence. She

said, "I've not had anyone else talk to me about [horizontal violence]. Ever!"

Mari believed that the behaviors exhibited by her female subordinates led her, at

times, to use poor judgment: "First few times that it happened, I reacted very poorly. It

made me angry that women would use women in the way they were doing it." She added

that "frustration and anger" were her two main reactions and that horizontal violence has

"prohibited me from being able to implement change." Wendy felt "very isolated" because "When I was younger I really did take it personally." She went on to add, "Women can sometimes be their own worst enemy." While reluctant to talk with others about the horizontal violence experienced, she introduced a new dimension to this when she explained,

Maybe [the female leaders] don't want to be seen as having problems. They want to be seen as, "I've got my act tighter, and everything is just fine here." It's just that trust relationship. There are some principals they don't know if they can trust or there are other female principals I don't know if I can trust.

"Credibility" was a huge issue for Suzi, who felt she really "had to prove myself that first year." Her age, classroom background, and credibility as a teacher played a part in this effort, as did juggling her relationship with men. She enjoyed a collegial relationship with other principals and was on guard for rumors about her and the men she worked with, as there had been unfounded rumors in the past.

Sara experienced a lot of self-doubt in her administrative relationships with teachers: "The message they sent to me [was] that I was not a good leader, that I [was] not a good administrator. I struggle with what does that mean about me as a person." One especially distressing situation she faced was having women "leave her building" because of the viciousness of other women. One paraprofessional had told her she was "so sick of the back-stabbing and the gossiping that was going on that she could not take it anymore" and she discontinued her employment at Sara's school. She added, "As a person, it hurt" to be excluded from the social events other women in the building shared; it really was

"lonely at the top." This impacted her personally, for she felt it had "stifled" the creative part of her.

Peg's hurt was steeped in factors she chose to change about herself to appear more "normal". She changed how she dressed, how she looked, and whom she developed relationships with in an effort to increase her connection and credibility with her female subordinates. There were comments made about her being "too young," "too inexperienced," even "incompetent." Peg said,

> I was definitely beginning to question if I was a good leader, and whether or not I could be a leader, whether or not even if I wanted to be in education anymore . . . I felt my professional growth was stifled because of [the horizontal violence].

Peg's first year in administration was torturous because other women collaborators had invested so much energy in protecting the status quo:

> When you start out you're so excited and you have such good ideas and you just are excited about making things happen. This is a terrific opportunity to right some of the wrongs you've seen and make things better for people. And I found out early on that [maintaining the] status quo was easier.

While each woman experienced the effects of different examples of horizontal violence, all were directly impacted by it professionally and personally. From deciding, in Peg's case, "Which battle do I want to fight?" to Tara's hurt over the "mendacious

spirit" exhibited by some women, it was apparent that horizontal violence diminished the full effectiveness of these female leaders in the school setting.

Positive Consequences for Leaders

Interestingly enough, while horizontal violence was a devastating phenomenon for participants, some positive effects were also noted by them, namely increased determination, overcompensated energy put into projects, renewed confidence, deepened reflection, and added sensitivity to staff. Mari said, "I'm probably more set in my beliefs. I've become stronger. I'm not going to succumb to what has happened around me. I'm not going to take a back seat. It just gives me more determination." Sara remarked, "I made some really positive changes as an administrator, as a result of [horizontal violence]. I have tried to be far more sensitive to the input and thinking of the staff." Rebecca found that experiences with horizontal violence had

> . . . made me a better leader. I have influenced people within this building to be stronger leaders, as well. To stand up for what is right and to become stronger leaders…I became more cemented in my beliefs. I became more cognizant of my leadership style, my communication style.

In the best of cases, as Wendy stated, "Once the teachers know how you function, and your expectations for them, most of them rise to the occasion."

While there was a silver lining in this cloud, most agreed that this was a painful route to some of the positive discoveries they made. Rebecca put it succinctly: "There was some good that came of [my experience with horizontal violence]. I wouldn't recommend it, but it was a good experience, as I look back." Possibly, the most positive

consequence, and certainly the most empowering for the participants, was the strategies they developed to aid them in dealing with the negative consequences that arose out of their experiences.

<div align="center">**Category 4: Desired Outcomes**</div>

Strategies

      While the purpose of the study was to explore the realities of horizontal violence in education, the most productive outcomes were the strategies discovered or improvised by the participants. Over the course of the study, the researcher developed a deep admiration for the courage exhibited by the participants as they voiced their experiences. Most appreciated were the strategies these women's stories laid out. Amazingly, participants found ways to deal with horizontal violence that were productive, effective, and reproducible by other female leaders in their work with female subordinates.

      Sara became more analytical, handled things with as much humor as possible, tried to connect more personally with staff, was honest and forthright, focused on the positive people in her building, removed negative people, and renewed her passion for her work. Of course she had strong convictions: "You have to trust yourself and know that what you are doing is right."

      Strategies that Wendy used were humor, directness, working with positive staff, developing a culture of openness and concerns among the staff, not allowing negative people to "do harm to the rest of the staff," gaining trust, gathering diagnostic information about staff personalities, changing "my way of working with females," and developing a support group.

      Mari relied on her family, developed her network with male administrators, focused her energies on positive people, learned to be better at playing political games,

relied on "best practices," stayed active in the community, avoided "small town talk," and remembered that she was "there for kids."

Suzi developed a tougher skin, learned to let things "roll off," was very purposeful and took steps to establish her credibility, built relationships with staff, and was very supportive with classroom discipline. She employed humor with staff, showed compassion to young mothers, listened, protected herself, confronted issues and addressed things specifically, empowered staff to address "bullying" behaviors amongst themselves, and viewed things holistically:

> I try not to brag about things, and try not to call attention to myself. I try and make darn sure I know what I am doing and I spend a lot of time trying to get my act together.

She added that it is important to know whom you can work with and "be sure of yourself and sure of your skills."

Julia called "a spade a spade" and found that being direct was most helpful. She found that when women engage in horizontal violence, "You redirect and tell them what it is you would prefer . . . what is the proper behavior." She also sought information, negotiated in a "softer kind of way," found time for personal reflection, found "safe people" with whom to share, sought out support from family and friends, developed sensitivity to settings, and educated her people about her style. The staff, she said, came to the conclusion that "Ok, this is what we've got: she's strong, she's tenacious, she's going to be here and these are her rules. And if we want to interact with her, these are the rules we'll abide by."

> Julia also developed a keener sense for recognizing a threatened female and sought to understand her. She also became more spiritual, more selective of the people she surrounded herself with, and let go of things. Her advice to aspiring female leaders was

Know who you are and don't ever let go of it. Figure out who you are before you enter in. Take routine opportunities to visit that so you don't get lost. Be your own best friend [and] have a support system that is separate from your job.

Rebecca learned to depend on her "rock solids," recommitted her energies to what needed to be done for kids, developed good lines of communication with staff, became direct in handling gossip and rumors, modeled appropriate behaviors, used humor, and communicated clear expectations for behavior. At one point she said she was thinking, "I don't care how nice your little outfit is, I still expect you to interact with kids." Rebecca worked to distinguish the "fat rabbits" from the "skinny rabbits" and prioritized her battles accordingly. She also stressed a need to be true to beliefs, confront privately, never sacrifice kids, analyze situations, and be proactive. She likened her initial failure to be proactive about the spread of horizontal violence to a cancer: When the tumor was contained, I should have dealt with it. Instead I waited until it had enough feelers out that it was starting to take over other parts of this school.

Peg worked to "put the really bad things out of my mind," pick her battles carefully, build up her support systems, have rationales ready for any decision she made, plan to ignore negative people, talk more with staff members about personal things, socialize more with staff, become a better listener, and develop her professional competence. Sadly, Peg also worked to downplay her own personal attractiveness by wearing her hair scraped back in a bun and dressing more conservatively. She shared that she has "always gotten along really well with men" and that she preferred to be around them because "they don't talk about you behind your back." But she has sacrificed those friendships in order to foster relationships with women and she felt that the sacrifice was worth it because, as she said, "I am better now. I am so much happier. I'm figuring out

that if I don't [have close friendships with men] I can have better friendships with women."

Robin developed a thicker skin, tended to "ignore any negative vibes," treated people positively, and adhered to the old adage, "You can catch more flies with honey than you can with vinegar." She also confessed to being less open, more protective, and more guarded. At the same time she admitted to being "less optimistic about peoples' reactions" and has come to believe that "No good deed goes unpunished." Robin has a future-looking strategy; she tracks the positive things she has done, keeps her résumé current, makes connections with other women in positions of power, maintains contact with her mentor, works to make changes when possible, and is determined to "take the high road when somebody else is taking the low road."

Tara made efforts to learn the unwritten rules of an organization, learned to "play the game," sought relationships with people on her level, sought affirmations from people outside of professional circles, and tried to stay informed. She worked hard to establish personal relationships, display more empathy toward others, pay closer attention to her personal mastery, find ways to work together with other women, foster leadership skills in other women, remove herself from negative influences and put a strong foot forward. With humor she could say: "You won't hurt me. You know, maybe you will, but it won't look like you're hurting me!" Tara also highlighted a more sophisticated strategy that she wants for all women:

> We have to establish some patterns that show leadership with people that aren't male. We have a lot of males who have had military examples and their images are military. They've had sports examples of leadership. They speak in sports metaphors. They speak in military metaphors and how do we speak? We have to establish our own metaphors. We haven't had any huge leaders that are female.

Rachel found herself becoming more direct and being more careful about whom she trusts. She said, "I need to make damn sure I'm very careful around them." She also recognized that destructive patterns need not be given a forum:

> You don't have to hear their side of the story. You don't have to try to understand why they did what they did. I think that would reduce the incidents [of horizontal violence] somewhat.

She has tried to be upfront, open, and assertive about her decisions, reminding herself about daily priorities and communicating expectations of professionalism to subordinates. With the focus on student achievement she even sought personal therapy to strengthen herself and renew her resolve for the job. Another strategy she employed is to "become a good actress. Get out there every day and put on your best face and go on as if nothing is happening." She continues to revisit what needs to be done, visualize how it needs to be done, reads, journals, and is "very, very cautious about relationships with female staff members."

Some strategies seemed more plausible, even more reasonable than others. However, all were honest efforts by the ten participants in this study to deal with an unpleasant reality. Some of the strategies developed over a span of several decades. Becoming more proficient in them, all could admit, took time. In each person the evolutionary process meant methods were honed to more effective versions. They were educators being educated as they worked to find ways to lead their female subordinates to more productive and positive behaviors. Strategies recognized as particularly effective and positive were increasing professional mastery, being purposeful and proactive, and being direct. These fell into the "out there" category. Several participants preferred a more reflective and less cognitive approach in combating horizontal violence. They

suggested becoming more spiritual, allowing time for self-reflection, seeking therapy,

and developing a softer leadership style. At least one strategy was offered tongue-in-

cheek: hire men.

Table 4.

Categories and Strategies

Categories	Strategies
Personal Action	Be a person of (positive) action.
	Be honest, direct and upfront.
	Be thoughtful and purposeful.
	Use planned ignoring/develop a thicker skin
	Focus on what you CAN control.
	Be self-confident.
	Attend to personal mastery/build credibility with competence.
	Avoid negative people.
	Be yourself. Don't camouflage your beliefs.
	Find ways to support those who are positive.
	Be human.
	Be aware---know that it's "out there", expect it, protect yourself.
	Become a good actress…put on your best face every day.
	Hire men.
	Try not to call attention to yourself.
Reflectiveness	Be self-reflective.
	Seek therapy to strengthen yourself.
	Give staff members time to be self-reflective.
	Become more spiritual.
	Be your own best friend.
Relationships	Develop relationships with people that encourage trust.
	Seek support and accolades away from the job.
	Garner support from superiors (Central Office).
	Handle things with humor.
	Be cautious about close relationships with female OR male staff.
	Have a softer leadership style.
Communication	Gather and share information.
	Be a good listener.
Culture	Develop a culture of trust and professionalism with your staff.
	Be aware of the dynamics around you…unwritten rules, reality.
	Have a shared vision.

Whatever the strategy—and there were many (see Table 4)—all participants found ways to reverse or minimize the powerful obstructiveness that a subordinate's behavior could have on them. These women continued the daily work of moving toward the goal of more effective leadership and more productive relationships with female subordinates regardless of personal pain or feelings of self-doubt that resulted from experiences with horizontal violence. Most significantly, they exhibited extreme resilience and courage in each of their particular journeys. As such, they shed light on the kind of person who may some day personify a leadership metaphor for females in all professions.

I thought I was the only one. I definitely thought I was the only one because no one ever talked about [horizontal violence] to me. I thought it was just me. I thought I was just bad. This is an incredibly important piece of work. [Women] need to know! Women need to know that they're not helping.   Peg

This [interview process] has been a good experience. It has been a good opportunity to think through some of those issues that sometimes we try hard not to think about. To be able to talk about it safely is, for me, useful.

Julia

Chapter Five

Conclusions

At the onset of this qualitative multiple case study the declared purpose was to raise consciousness about the phenomenon of horizontal violence in the advancement of female educational leaders. It was the hope of the researcher that by understanding horizontal violence, its effects on leaders, and ways to deflect the negative behaviors, female leaders would be more likely to counter the effects in positive, productive ways. The secondary purpose was to educate aspiring female administrators about the possibility of horizontal violence in their careers. And finally, the study was to serve as an inspiration for veteran administrators who had experienced the phenomenon but did not know how prevalent it was for upwardly mobile women.

The overarching question of this research was, "To what degree does horizontal violence or indirect aggression exist in the advancement ranks of K-12 education for female administrators?" As the findings portion of this study indicated, it is apparent that the answer was, "To a high degree." While that appeared to be a simplistic response, the data support the response. All participants reported high degrees of horizontal violence among their female subordinates. As laid out in Chapter Four, frequency and intensity of any particular behavior varied among participants.

The study has served its purpose. The honest sharing of personal stories has served to educate others, identify specific and tried solutions, and provide a cathartic outlet for participants. The isolation and alienation that these ten female leaders had experienced because of the already identified secretive nature of this phenomenon has been reduced by open conversations with others.

The research provided an authentic venue for the discussions to begin among the primary stakeholders through the purposeful identification of targeted audiences. It is now up to school officials, university personnel, and boards of education to move this discussion forward with purposeful action of their own. Some directions for this action were clearly identified in the findings portion of the study.

Through the sharing of their stories, participants uncovered their truths and corroborated much of what was initially exposed in the existing literature about horizontal violence. While comprehensive (though not totally inclusive) here are some of those truths:

- Horizontal violence is a reality for women.

- Horizontal violence does exist in the world of education.

- Female leaders are victimized by horizontal violence.

- Horizontal violence can be devastating in the development process of female leaders.

- Power, and a desire for more power, is a motivating factor for horizontal violence.

- Jealousy by subordinates toward female superiors is a motivating factor for horizontal violence.

- Socialization of women contributes to the perpetuation of horizontal violence.

- A female leader's own socialization patterns may affect her leadership style thus inviting or diminishing the perpetuation of horizontal violence in her leadership realm.

- There are specific strategies women can employ to guard against and minimize the effects of horizontal violence.

- There are varying degrees of success with any specific strategy.

- A female leader's competence and confidence can be an indicator of future success with female subordinates.

- Horizontal violence continues to be "women's dirty little secret" in that there continues to be a high degree of secretiveness among victims of horizontal violence and a reluctance to talk about experiences of horizontal violence.

- Horizontal violence reduces the effectiveness of any workplace shared by women.

- Women use horizontal violence as a means to dominate, manipulate, and diminish other women.

- Women are likely to view another woman's success as a judgment about their own position and therefore behave in ways to diminish another's position through gossip, rumors, and mendacity.

Recommendations

1. More attention to the socialization patterns of girls: By reexamining the socialization patterns of girls and promoting the understanding that girls will be who we teach them to be will aid in the development of more productive

behaviors. Challenging "typical female" responses and the attitude that "girls will be girls" is likely to replace inappropriate socialization with more productive thinking. A renewed consciousness in the 21st century will help in the understanding that barriers of sex rarely apply in the workplace. Consequently, women being socialized to respond overtly and openly to all leaders—male and female—is likely to increase production in the workplace and the effectiveness of leaders. Women trained, as girls, that there are reasonable, responsible, and mature ways to communicate dismay, disagreement, and displeasure to other women without diminishing or destroying another will be more productive employees *and* leaders.

2. Promoting an open conversation among women: In deconstructing the strength of the hold that horizontal violence has on women, an "outing" of the phenomenon will serve to reduce its negative impact in the workforce and on women in all situations. If open and honest dialogue can occur with full knowledge and naming of the reality of horizontal violence, solutions are more likely to be sought and employed. Sabotage minimizes the full effectiveness of any professional group and sabotage is the end result of any act of horizontal violence among women.

3. Preparation in educational leadership: Additionally, specific course work in the university certification classes for emerging female leaders will arm all graduates with the tools necessary to experience success in their pursuits after degree completion. An orientation to the realities and ramifications of horizontal violence and an immersion in exploring strategies to combat or deflect

horizontal violence will help insure the success and effectiveness of aspiring

female leaders. Leadership is difficult work in the best of situations and

emerging leaders must have opportunities to explore and develop resources in

safe environments. The university is the most natural and appropriate venue for

this to occur.

Considerations for Future Studies

Over the course of the research, several peripheral themes or questions emerged.

While real, they were outside the scope of this study. While interesting and intriguing to the

researcher, their pursuit would not have been appropriate within the context of this study.

However, they merit mention as consideration for future research.

During the interviews a concept began to emerge relative to who are the most

serious perpetrators of horizontal violence. Does schedule flexibility and access to other

staff members make it easier for certified support staff, such as Title 1 specialists, special

education teachers, speech teachers, or other such support personnel to spread discontent

among other staff? This question could be central to another study.

A study which could yield interesting results would be: "*How* are girls/women

socialized to be effective leaders?" or possibly more pertinent, "*Who* socializes effective

female leaders?" Some of the interesting patterns in this study showed that these fields

merit further investigation.

There has been extensive work done in the nursing field on the phenomenon of

horizontal violence. This project looked at its incidence in K-12 educational circles. It

would be enlightening to have other studies to see whether the phenomenon exists in all

careers or whether it is unique to nursing and education. Another fertile area of study

would be to examine whether horizontal violence in the workplace was dependent on high percentages of subordinate females who had traditionally been shepherded by males such as is found in nursing and education.

Another area for consideration would be the examination of this phenomenon with women in higher education. Does horizontal violence exist among college and university women? How do women fare as they move up the promotional ladder in college and university settings? Where are mentors found among women as they climb the ladders of success?

Additionally, an investigation of men's reactions and responses to horizontal violence could produce interesting results. There are multiple facets to such an exploration: How do male subordinates respond when observing horizontal violence among professional female peers? How do male superiors respond to observations of horizontal violence among subordinates? What kind of support can women expect from men regarding this phenomenon?

Personal Reflections

In our country's history, there still exists a novelty about women in positions of power. While not true in matriarchal societies, it is certainly the case in our Western society. Even here, however, these mental barriers are being broken down. Women are stepping into positions traditionally held by men, and as they rise to positions where they have influence or directing other women they will have to learn to utilize strategies not part of the traditional arsenal of effective tools for leaders. Why? Principally because other women throw up roadblocks and even aggressively, though often unconsciously, resent that "one of their own" could do so well. The results of this study demonstrate that amply. But

this is not the time to assess blame as to realize that women no longer have the luxury of expecting someone else to fix this problem for them. It is time to find their collective voice. This voice must "own" the insidiousness and mendacity of some of these socialized behaviors and work to correct the socialization process for girls/women in the future. This cannot be accomplished without courage. This cannot be accomplished without education, resolve, and unified force. This cannot be accomplished until women echo Rachel's word, "I'm mad as hell and I'm not taking it any more!"

It Doesn't Have to Be This Way

As our little girls grow into women,
It doesn't have to be this way for them.

We can change our course and means;
We can alter goals and dreams.
We can show them better roads;
We can teach them truer codes.

As our little girls grow into women,
It doesn't have to be this way for them.

One voice raised by many is a force.
It will take your voice, too, of course.
All who push and prod, who love and care,
Can work together for what's good and fair.

As our little girls grow into women,
It doesn't have to be this way for them.

We must move a different way
In how we work and how we play.
We must lean on different rules,
Create and use these better tools.

As our little girls grow into women,
It doesn't have to be this way for them.

You, and I, and we, and they,
Have a part in this new way.
Let us teach our girls to dream
A brand new way to be a team.

As our little girls grow into women,
It doesn't have to be this way for them.

Time's too short, so much to do,
Voices raised too weak and few.
Where are those who dream of more?
For there's work to changing lore.

As our little girls grow into women,
Let's change this way for them.   **Midge Odermann Mougey (2004)**

References

Berg, B. L. (1998). *Qualitative research method for the social sciences* (3rd ed.). Boston:
Allyn & Bacon.

Bjorkqvist, K., Lagerspetz, K. M. J., & Osterman, K. (1992). *Direct & indirect
aggression scales.* Retrieved February 26, 2004 from the World Wide Web:
http://www.vasa.abo.fi/svf/up/dias/htm

Blackman, M. C., & Fenwick, L. T. (2000). Looking for leaders in a time of change.
Education Week, 19, 29.

Blanton, B., Lybecker, C., & Spring, N. (1998). *Position statement on horizontal
violence*. Retrieved June 15, 2002, from the World Wide Web:
http://www.nurseadvocate.org/hvstate.html

Brown, M. L., & Gilligan, C. (1992). *Meeting at the crossroads: Women's psychology
and girls' development*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Chesler, P. (2001). *Woman's inhumanity to woman*. New York: Thunder's Mouth
Press/Nation Books.

Coloroso, B. (2003). *The bully, the bullied, and the bystander: From preschool to high
school—how parents and teachers can help break the cycle of violence*.
New York: Harper Collins.

Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Qualitative & quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA:
Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five
traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Eichenbaum, L., & Orbach, S. (1987). *Between women: Love, envy, and competition in women's friendships.* New York: Viking.

Estrich, S. (2000). *Sex and power*. New York: Riverhead Books.

Flogging the tall poppy syndrome. (n.d.). Retrieved November 4, 2003, from the World Wide Web: http://www.convictcreations.com/culture/poppy/htm

Frankl, V. E. (1984). *Man's search for meaning: An introduction to logotherapy* (3rd ed.). New York: Simon & Schuster.

Funk, C. (2000). *Horizontal violence: Cutting down the tall poppy.* In A. Pankake, G. Schroth, & C. Funk (Eds.), *Women as school executives: The complete picture* (pp. 244-252). Commerce, TX: Texas Council of Women School Executives.

Gurian, M. (1996). *The wonder of boys: What parents, mentors and educators can do to shape boys into exceptional men*. New York: Pocket Books.

Hales, D. (1999). *Just like a woman: How gender science is redefining what makes us female*. New York: Bantam Books.

Harbin, T. J. (2000). *Beyond anger: A guide for men: How to free yourself from the grip of anger and get more out of life*. New York: Marlowe.

Harmon, A. (2004). *Internet gives teenage bullies weapons to wound from afar*. Retrieved August 26, 2004, from the World Wide Web: http://www.nytimes.com/2004/08/26/education/26bully.html

Heim, P., & Murphy, S. A. (2001). *In the company of women: Indirect aggression among women: Why we hurt each other and how to stop*. New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher/Putnam.

Josefowitz, N. (1983). *Neither Cain nor Abel. Is this where I was going?* New York: Warner.

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

Lorber, J. (1994). *Paradoxes of gender*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1989). *Designing qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Miller, D. L. (2001). *Qualitative approaches to educational research*. EDUC 900K packet, University of Nebraska at Lincoln.

Mouly, V. S., & Sankaran, J. (2003). *The tall poppy syndrome in New Zealand: An exploratory investigation*. Retrieved February 11, 2004, from the World Wide Web: http://www.business.auckland.ad.nz/personal_webpages/mer/people/bfsmouly/tall%20poppy%20syndrome.doc

Pipher, M. (1994). *Reviving Ophelia: Saving the selves of adolescent girls*. New York: Ballantine.

Pollack, W. (1998). *Real boys: Rescuing our sons from the myths of boyhood.* New York: Random House.

Secunda, V. (1992). *Women and their fathers*. New York: Bantam Doubleday Dell.

Simmons, R. (2002). *Odd girl out: The hidden culture of aggression in girls*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt.

Tanenbaum, L. (2002). *Catfight: Women and competition*. New York: Seven Stories.

Tesch, R. (1990). *Qualitative research: Analysis types and software tools.* New York: Falmer.

Tracinski, R. (2003). *Martha and the tall poppies*. Retrieved November 4, 2003, from the

World Wide Web: http://www.aynrand.org/medialink/marthastewart.shtml

Wiseman, R. (2002). *Queen bees & wannabes: Helping your daughter survive cliques,*

gossip, boyfriends & other realities of adolescence. New York: Three Rivers.