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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

In *Educating the Majority: Women Challenge Tradition in Higher Education*, Pearson, Shavlik, and Touchton (1989) declare, “Since the early 1970s women have begun to be taken more seriously by higher education and many changes have occurred” (p. 7). The development of affirmative action programs, the rise of the women’s movement, and an increase in the numbers of females pursuing college degrees and professional careers, have caused higher education to take notice of women in the field. Over time, women have made steady gains in their representation among the administrative ranks of higher education. In the mid 1970s, approximately 23 percent of the 102,465 full time higher education executives, managers or administrators were women (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 1981). But by 1997, that number grew to 45 percent (National Center for Education Statistics, 1999).

Contributors to the literature on educational administration in the 1990s have projected that women are in the field to stay. Hill and Ragland (1995) predict through their interviews of female educational leaders “that more women will move into administration because people in general are now much more open to women as leaders” (p. 35). North (1991) makes this assessment:

Coming at a time when campuses are expanding their notions of the status quo to
accommodate cultural diversity, the idea that women may offer alternative approaches to administration and communication may be more easily accepted today than perhaps at any other time in our history. (p. 52)

The managing partner of Korn/Ferry search firm believes women can be optimistic about their chances of becoming a college or university president. "In general, there is an increasing acceptance of women candidates. The momentum [for hiring women] is so strong" (Green, 1996, p. 1).

As the presence of female administrators in higher education has grown, so, too, has the research in the field expanded. Moore (1983), a regular contributor to the literature on women in higher education administration, states that five "rough" categories describe the literature that has evolved by that time:

There are a number of nonempirical articles that detail factors believed to reduce opportunities such as a lack of role models and mentors, socialization patterns and discrimination. A second class of articles reports on programs designed for women and minorities who aspire to administration – their location, structure and usefulness (Berry, 1979).

A third category includes studies that examine faculty mobility, affirmative action, and related issues. Some of these include administrators but have little or no detailed analysis of the administrative group (Andrusis, 1975). The fourth category of studies are those which provide statistical information on the locations, titles and salary levels for women and minority administrators, but give little dynamic information on the process of movement among positions and
institutions and very little or no background information on the individuals (Howard, 1978; Van Alstyne, 1977; Frances and Mensel, 1981).

Finally, there are a few studies which create “profiles” of administrators, but there are several factors that reduce the usefulness of these studies. For example, most of these studies are limited in scope; they concentrate on only one position (e.g., president), or only one type of school (e.g., university) or only one state or region. (Moore, 1983, p. 2)

The intersection of this growth in literature with expanding numbers of female administrators leads to this synthesis. As women began to join the field of higher education administration, more and more research emerged that examined a number of topics related to female administrators. In order to “facilitate future administrative positioning of females” (Hubbard and Robinson, 1994), the literature needs to be integrated. Through this integration, this synthesis hopes to reach a more comprehensive understanding of women’s place in higher education administration, and provide new knowledge that more objectively explains women’s status in higher education administrative ranks, both for present and future enlightenment.

Statement of the Question

A considerable body of literature about women in higher education administration has developed since 1970. As Moore (1983) has categorized, most of it addresses career opportunities, training programs, mobility, career advancement and administrator profiles. The research has also expanded to include leadership studies of higher education administrators. A very small proportion of the research seeks to synthesize the findings of
the literature over time.

This synthesis focuses on the profile of female higher education administrators, their career advancement and their leadership characteristics. Through systematic review of relevant research, studies and narratives from 1970 to 1999, this synthesis' intent will be to address the following research problem.

What does the literature report about women in higher education administration from 1970 to 1999 with respect to presence, career path, and leadership characteristics; and how has this literature evolved over time regarding the profile of these females?

To support the intended integration of the literature, some subsidiary questions will be addressed in this synthesis as well.

1. What does the literature from 1970 to 1999 report about common career paths, role model influence, the impact of socialization, and encountered career barriers of women in higher education administration?

2. What does the literature from 1970 to 1999 report about the leadership definitions, leadership characteristics, influence of personal values, subordinates’ views, and decision making traits of women in higher education administration?

Definition of Terms

The questions that this synthesis address involve some frequently cited terms, which have been defined as follows for the purposes of this study:

Administration - Within the university or college structure there are administrative units which comprise the administration of the institution. Generally, but not exclusively non-
teaching, these employees serve to support the organization at varying levels. Providing appropriate direction, regulating decision-making effectively, and supervising all operations of the institution are generally considered to be responsibilities of the university or college administration. Members of this unit often hold titles such as assistant/associate director, director, manager, assistant/associate dean, dean, vice-president, and president.

Affirmative action – Swanson (1981) in the introduction to her annotated bibliography, presents a working definition of this term:

The premise behind affirmative action, the Office for Civil Rights wrote, was to take "positive action" to "overcome the effects of systematic institutional forms of exclusion and discrimination.

The Guidelines required the employer "to make additional efforts to recruit, employ and promote qualified members of groups formerly excluded, even if that exclusion cannot be traced to particular discriminatory actions on the part of the employer.

Thus, the affirmative action concept means that employers must take active steps to seek out qualified women and minorities for employment and promotion. (pp. v-vi).

Androgynous – This adjective is used to describe one who has the characteristics of both genders.

Career path - As simply as it is phrased, this term refers to the path one takes to progress in one's career. Generally thought of as a "ladder" approach, one chooses a vocation and
then pursues training and positions which move one up to the desired status of authority in that field.

Faculty - The faculty of a university or college has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process (Peterson, 1991, p. 161).

Higher education - Within the United States educational system, this term generally refers to post-secondary education, not including proprietary school or military corps coursework. The two-year college, four-year college, and university settings serve as the venues for receiving a higher education (earning a bachelor's and above degree) following the completion of a high school diploma program. These higher education institutions are either independently (private) or state controlled.

Leadership - A singular definition of leadership has never been developed with total agreement; scores of scholars have contributed theories and descriptions which vary. Birnbaum has contributed frequently to the literature on leadership in higher education. He notes that, “… in higher education, there is a strong resistance to leadership as it is generally understood in more traditional and hierarchical organizations” (Birnbaum, 1988, p. 22). Birnbaum postulates that the social exchange theory is particularly suited to higher education leadership. This theory assumes reciprocity; leaders provide needed services to a group in exchange for the group's approval and compliance with the leader's demands. The group agrees to accept the authority of the leader in exchange for the rewards and benefits the leader can bring them. Birnbaum (1988) states, “Leaders are as
dependent on followers as followers are on leaders" (p. 23), and also cautions that in the environment within which administrators function, constraints which exist can affect the leadership exercised:

"Through their behaviors over time, leaders influence the constraints within which those at lower levels function. Presidents and other administrators may not be able to make dramatic changes in their institutions most of the time, but by recognizing the organizational characteristics of their institution, they may still be able to provide leadership... {The administrator's} responsibility is to keep the institution in proper balance, and not to 'run' it" (Birnbaum, 1988, p. 203). It is presumed that Birnbaum's definition will commonly apply to the leadership that is exercised by the women examined in this synthesis; however, the variety of leadership positions the women hold may necessitate some flexibility in the application of this definition.

Purpose of the Research

The purpose of this research is one of integration; to give meaning to isolated facts, as Boyer (1991) points out, and putting these facts into perspective. Boyer defines the scholarship of integration as "... serious, disciplined work that seeks to interpret, draw together, and bring new insight to bear on original research" (p. 19).

Review of the literature spanning 30 years (1970 to 1999), years in which women's representation in higher education administration increased considerably, yields a diversity of theories and findings; theories and findings as interesting as the times in which they were published. Presented on a continuum, the research which has been
conducted and the writings which have surfaced can be interpreted in a fashion more closely resembling a pattern instead of a phenomenon. Common themes, key findings and new knowledge in the field will be presented as a synthesis, giving new meaning to previous research conducted and uncovering more new knowledge as the synthesis attempts to answer the research and subsidiary questions.

The limited number of syntheses previously published about women in educational administration (and cited below in the review of related literature) have commonly focused on the school setting (K-12) and not the post-secondary institutions. The few syntheses covering higher education concentrate primarily on women faculty, or in analyzing appointments made in higher education. This synthesis seeks to provide a more comprehensive approach to the integration of the literature about female higher education administrators.

Therefore, this synthesis of the literature on women in higher education administration from 1970 to 1999 will review those studies and narratives that address profile, career advancement and leadership characteristics of women in higher education administration; it then presents the findings of the research in an integrated fashion, exposing new perspectives about the field of female leadership in higher education. The conclusions of the synthesis can serve to inform others as they contemplate the role of female administrators in the 21st century rendition of higher education, especially regarding the evolution of educational leadership.

Significance of the Research

There may be a number of reasons why scholars seek to examine issues related to
female career advancement and leadership in schools and post-secondary institutions, but
the literature of the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s seems most intent on addressing the weak
representation of women among administrative ranks. Many of the researchers focus on
the relatively small number of women who had attained a position in educational
administration. Dingerson, Rodman, and Wade, (1980), for instance, report data which
shows that nearly 80 percent of newly created administrative positions were filled by
white males; the American Council on Education, Office of Women (1995) reports that in
1984 that only nine percent of all institutions were headed by women; in 1972, Astin
(1977) reports that of the more than 1800 institutions surveyed, only 13.7 percent had any
female deans; and Drum (1993) finds that 29 percent of the vice presidents of student
affairs divisions are women. Dohrmann (1982) puts this in perspective by stating, "The
area of research concerned with the proportional scarcity of women in administrative
positions is fairly new. It is not that the phenomenon did not exist before. It existed but it
was not considered a problem" (p. 38).

Researchers also pursued studies on women in higher education administration
because the previous literature on the topic was perceived to be very limited. Moore and
Wollitzer (1979) review the literature on academic women since 1970, and they report
about the quantity of studies available in those nine years: "There are very few studies of
individual women presidents, deans or other top level women. The best researched area is
in student personnel having to do with deans of women" (p. 17). They also contend that
"Little is actually known, although much is presumed, about women's behavior in
positions of academic leadership and responsibility" (p. 12). Dohrmann's original intent
in her 1982 study was to look at administrative positions in higher education only, but "the scarcity of research on this topic in institutions of higher education had led to the inclusion of all types of organizational settings in this paper" (p. 1). Wheeler and Tack (1989) complained, "The lack of women subjects in higher education leadership has led to an inability to generalize findings" (p. 3). When Cimperman undertook her study in 1986 to analyze women administrators' perceptions of self, she explained, "The female higher education administrator was chosen as the subject of study because of the lack of data on her view of her leadership behavior and her history of low status" (p. 2). Etaugh (1985) reviews the research to assess changes in the status of female faculty and administrators since 1982, only to find that, "Less information is available regarding women administrators than women faculty" (p. 6). Moore and Wollitzer (1979) state that "Research on women in academic administration is remarkably sparse, undoubtedly owing both to the relative scarcity of such women and the short time span since research awareness has turned to this sector of academe" (p. 65).

In an attempt to redress this lack of research, more writers (primarily female) studied the status of women administrators in higher education. As the research efforts expanded and the findings were reported, the availability of literature and data on the topic of women administrators in higher education grew. Now that the research has expanded, this synthesis seeks to coordinate these findings in an attempt to interpret the literature, and address what these findings mean when collected as a whole.

A significant reason for pursuing a synthesis of the literature is also as a response to the recommendations for further study urged by a number of scholars. Shakeshaft
emerges as a dominant voice in these recommendations. Although she focused primarily on school administration in her studies, her conclusions about women in administration were more far reaching. Shakeshaft (1982) wrote definitively, "Because of the quantity of research already done and the expectation that this is an area of inquiry ripe for further research, it becomes important to synthesize what has been undertaken, not only to know what has been done, but also to see in what direction the research is moving" (p. 3). She also points out that professors of educational administration had little interest in researching this field and thus, the bulk of the research was done at the doctoral level. But Shakeshaft goes on to say that the reviews of the literature in the dissertations she examined which researched women in educational administration "tend to cover any piece of literature that relates to women, whether or not it is pertinent to the subject being investigated" (p. 24).

Freeman (1977) also suggests that integration of the literature is needed. She conducts her study of higher education women administrators in Washington, D.C: 

...to explore the backgrounds of those women in top-level administrative positions to determine what is, rather than to predict, to discover significant variables among the women, to discover relationships among variables and to lay the groundwork for later, more systematic and rigorous testing of hypothesis. (p. 2).

Kaplan, Secor and Tinsley (1984) state, "What are needed are longitudinal studies of women and men, both majority and minority, in different types of institutions and in different regions of the country that will yield detailed information about the factors that
promote and hinder advancement" (p. 87) of women. Gappa and Uehling (1979) point out that profile information of women in higher education administration quickly becomes dated and needs to be updated. Schonwetter and others (1993) suggests that more research be done regarding job satisfaction and competitiveness variables among the older and newer generations of women administrators in higher education. Hubbard and Robinson (1994) contend, “Because of the underrepresentation of females in administrative positions in higher education, there is a need to explore and evaluate these characteristics in order to facilitate future administrative positioning of females” (p. 3).

These writers have urged further study on women in higher education administration as a means to evaluation, with emphasis on relationships and trends and patterns in the research. This synthesis proposes to address the research problem stated in this chapter, as well as to satisfy the recommendations of previous writers to synthesize research. Through the integration of the literature, the synthesis hopes to contribute new knowledge to the field. Following Boyer’s (1991) call for “the power of critical analysis and interpretation” (p. 19) in conducting this research, this author embarks on the journey Boyer describes as moving from “information to knowledge and even, perhaps, to wisdom” (p. 19). The conclusions of this synthesis can serve to provide direction for others who seek to examine the evolution of female higher education administrators’ career advancement and leadership development.

Limitations of the Research

This synthesis proposes to integrate the literature regarding women in higher education administration from 1970 to 1999. To keep the research manageable, the
studies and narratives included are limited to those that focus on women in administration in American colleges and universities. This synthesis does not include studies covering school (K through 12) administration, business management and not-for-profit organizations unless those studies present information that has contributed to the literature regarding women in higher education administration. Women in proprietary school administration are also excluded. The topics of discrimination, gender differences and "glass ceiling" are not included as topics of focus in the questions this study addresses. However, these topics are discussed as they contribute to the questions this synthesis attempts to answer.

The literature included in the synthesis is not limited to a specific category of female administrators, such as presidents or vice-presidents or academic officers only. Any level of administration which is covered by the relevant studies is deemed acceptable for the purposes of this research.

This study does not include literature on women administrators produced prior to 1970, and includes literature up to 1999 to allow analysis of the advancement of women over time in higher education administration. The advent of affirmative action initiatives (several important pieces of affirmative action legislation were enacted in 1972) points to 1970 as an appropriate starting point for the integration of literature on women in higher education administration. Further, Finkelstein (1984) writes, "The decade of the 1970s witnessed a heightened consciousness of the status of women and minorities in academe-a function of the heightened self-consciousness raised by the women's and civil rights movements" (p. 66).
It should be noted that a number of the studies cited in the literature have small sample sizes; some question how truly representative the samples are, or if the varied ages and experiences of their subjects impact the generalized findings. For example, Mark (1981) states:

Few studies of women leaders have examined their actual behaviors. Instead, most have relied upon subordinates' perceptions of them as boss, or on attitudes and values of upper management males which have been found to be biased by sex-role stereotypes (p. 192).

Mark also points out, "Few studies compared females and males across the same level of leadership....Typically, female middle managers have been compared with non-management personnel" (p. 193). This synthesis must accept for review the variety of literature on women administrators that exists, regardless of its flaws, inconsistent research approaches, or any bias that a writer might bring to his or her work.

Organization of the Synthesis

This synthesis integrates the narratives, research and findings of the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s regarding women in higher education. As a nonempirical study, it does not seek discovery of any new statistical data or survey analyses, but rather, focuses entirely on the review of relevant existing literature to discover what this integration reveals. Relevant literature includes that which addresses the research questions identified in this chapter. The presentation of findings of the literature, as well as the conclusions of the synthesis, follow a thematic approach. That is, the synthesis addresses the themes of the research questions, which include: the evolution of the literature; profile of women
administrators; career advancement of women administrators; female leadership characteristics.

The very basis of this synthesis is in fact a review of the literature, and therefore no separate chapter detailing the literature is included. However, a presentation of the major syntheses, theories and findings that exist regarding women in educational administration is included within this chapter.

A profile of women in higher education administration is placed as Chapter II of the synthesis. This serves as context for the following chapters, and depicts the status of women in higher education administration as it pertains to degrees earned and administrative positions attained. The chapter profiles the changes in the numbers of female students and administrators from 1970 to 1999, and expands on the demographics of those female administrators as well as the positions they hold.

Chapters III and IV address the subsidiary questions posed in this study, specifically regarding the career advancement and leadership characteristics reported in the literature on women in higher education administration from 1970 to 1999. The conclusions that develop as an outcome of the integration process are presented in Chapter V. It is also expected that recommendations for areas of further research will naturally develop through the review of the literature. This set of recommendations is also included in Chapter V.

The references listed include only those included in this synthesis. The entire collection of literature that was originally reviewed for the synthesis is not listed, but is available.
Review of Related Literature

As a synthesis, the review of related literature is the very body of this study. It is more appropriate, therefore, to review the relevant syntheses, key contributors to the literature, and key theories and findings in this section.

Review of relevant syntheses - This study seeks to integrate the literature on women in higher education administration from 1970 to 1999. Other syntheses, albeit limited, have been done; however some of the syntheses do not focus strictly on women administrators in higher education, but instead analyze research on women in school (K - 12) administration, or faculty. Other syntheses covering higher education administration do not address an expanse of time as wide as this synthesis addresses. However, all these syntheses serve as models in structure and intent for this study, and they are therefore included in this review.

Adkison (1981) undertook one of the more comprehensive studies regarding the status of women in educational administration. "Women in School Administration: A Review of the Research" focuses on the research published since 1974. It covers women in K - 12 administration only, and reviews the theories explaining women's underrepresentation in administration. Using a thematic approach, her review examines six theoretical frameworks that have guided the research on women in administration, and then applies these frameworks to social intervention strategies. These frameworks include: rising aspirations and organizational responses; career socialization and mobility; structural characteristics of organizations; social status and power; psychoanalytic perspectives; and competing explanations.
Shakeshaft (1982; 1987) also focuses primarily on women in school administration in her studies. In 1982, she presented "A Framework for Studying Schools as Work Settings for Women Leaders," and in 1987 presented "Organizational Theory and Women: Where are We?" The 1982 study examines 114 doctoral dissertations on women in educational administration from 1973 to 1979; it presents an analysis of the research, identifies the issues treated in the dissertations, examines the methods of the dissertations, and evaluates the quality of the research. She also utilizes a thematic treatment in her analysis, and presents a new overview of the doctoral research conducted thus far on women in educational administration. "Although the women administrator was one of the most researched topics in the discipline during the 1970s," she writes, "no definitive work was undertaken to discuss the results of these studies" (p. 3). She concludes that only 35.86 percent of the studies make an overall contribution to the literature; those were the only studies which did not repeat research that had already been replicated, or did not research what Shakeshaft calls "trivial" problems which do not contribute to the overall literature on women in administration. Shakeshaft in this study also proposes six domains for future inquiry in an effort to "map a research direction": managerial framework, sociology of occupations framework, symbolic interaction framework, feminist framework, revisionist framework and structural framework. She concludes that while the research in the above six domains will not provide a total understanding of the school as a workplace for women leaders, it is a beginning toward reconstruction of theory in which the female voice is heard. Her 1987 paper also presents a synthesis of the current status of the woman administrator in schools, concluding that
perhaps the female school administrator is a more effective school manager. In looking at the women administrators, Shakeshaft identifies some common themes which describe characteristics of these women: they see relationships as central, focus on teaching and learning and building community, possess different communication styles than men, are conscious of their tokenism, and have a collaborative style.

Moore and Wollitzer (1979) investigate the role of women as higher education faculty and administrators in “Recent Trends in Research on Academic Women: A Bibliographic Review and Analysis.” They find that the theme of discrimination was central to the research on women administrators, and, in general, the research of others shows that administrative employment patterns vary substantially by race and gender. Their research includes literature on academic women since 1970 through 1978.

In 1981, Carlson and Schmuck produced “The Sex Dimensions of Careers in Educational Management: Overview and Synthesis,” as part of an “Educational Policy and Management” journal. This review examined personal contingencies and structural contingencies as they impact administrative careers; however, the focus of this work is on K-12 educational administration.

Moore (1982a) authored “Towards a Synthesis of Organizational Theory and Historical Analysis: The Case of Academic Women,” in which she joined historical analysis with contemporary social theory to examine women in the academy. However, her focus was on nineteenth century academic women. In 1983, Moore conducted a national study of administrators (“Leaders in Transition: A National Study of Higher Education Administrators”) and followed that with “Today’s Academic Leaders: A
Finkelstein (1984) attempts to evaluate the status of women and minority faculty in his synthesis, "Women and Minority Faculty." This study focuses on women and minority faculty in higher education administration. In evaluating the status of these constituencies among the faculty and then presenting his conclusions, Finkelstein presents a good model for a synthesis examining gender status in the educational setting. The study begins with a brief overview of the current status of women and minority faculty, and then attempts to "identify alternative explanations for patterns of differences that do exist and to weigh the extant empirical evidence related to each of these alternative explanations" (p. 67). Finkelstein does this by looking at various status reports of institutions and professional associations, independent studies and national level surveys.

Female faculty were also included in a presentation by Etaugh (1985), "Changes in the Status of Women Faculty and Administrators in Higher Education Since 1972." She based her analysis entirely on a literature review, another close model to follow for this synthesis. She also infused a thematic approach, examining themes of salary, rank, tenure, employment patterns. All the studies she reviewed indicate that few women occupy administrative positions, although progress has been made in increasing the number of females represented in administration. In integrating the studies she reviewed, Etaugh concludes that women were especially underrepresented at public coeducational institutions, and that women earn less than men in virtually all positions.
Mark (1986) examined gender differences among mid-level administrators in higher education, basing her review on a variety of sources of references dating from 1953 to 1985. She utilized a thematic approach in a social psychological framework, focusing on specific research concerns.

Hensel (1991) focuses on women faculty, and provides a model for this synthesis in its thematic treatment of identified issues as well as in its scope. Her work, "Realizing Gender Equality in Higher Education: The Need to Integrate Work/Family Issue," integrates the status and representation of women in academe with the following themes: gender discrimination, differences in scholarly productivity between men and women, women managing conflicts between family and career, and recommendations on what universities can do to support women in academe to achieve their full potential.

In 1992, Twale conducted a study of higher education administrative positions advertised in the 1986 and 1991 "Chronicles of Higher Education" to assess changes over a five year period in the administrative hierarchy, "comparing changes between internal and external hirings between public and private in institutions," as well as "to identify any emerging career pathways for women" (p.2).

Review of key contributors to the literature - Those who have undertaken the study of women in educational administration are predominantly women. Although not included in this synthesis, a significant number of the works are dissertations. The key contributors discussed here are likely to have conducted dissertation study in this field, and expanded their research on women in educational administration throughout their careers. The significant research is referenced as follows.
Charol Shakeshaft (1982; 1987; 1989), as noted previously, is a key contributor to the literature, although her focus is K-12 administration. The findings of her research are often more far-reaching. Along with her 1982 and 1987 syntheses, Shakeshaft collaborated with others (Shakeshaft, Gilligan, and Pierce, 1984) to author "Preparing Women School Administrators," and in 1989 wrote "Women in Educational Administration." Her recommendations about the focus of, and approaches to, the research are applicable to higher education studies as well.

Kathryn Moore can be qualified as a major contributor to the literature on women in administration; Moore focuses on higher education administration in her research. Besides her synthesis of 1982a previously mentioned, Moore wrote many papers and articles, as well as presented at numerous conferences. Moore and Wollitzer's paper (1979) "Recent Trends in Research on Academic Women: A Bibliographic Review and Analysis," was followed by her article, "Women Administrators and Mobility: The Second Struggle" (Moore and Sagaria, 1981). She also co-authored that year, "Dynamics of the Mentor-Protégé Relationship in Developing Women as Academic Leaders" (Moore and Salimbene, 1981). Moore wrote "The Role of Mentors in Developing Leaders for Academe," (1982b) and co-authored "Differential Job Change and Stability Among Academic Administrators" (Moore and Sagaria, 1982). She worked with three other colleagues in 1983 on "The Structure of Presidents' and Deans' Careers," (Moore, Salimbene, Marlier, and Bragg, 1983), and also wrote "Leaders in Transition: a National Study of Higher Education Administrators" (1983). These were followed by her article, "Careers in College and University Administration: How Women are Affected," (Moore,

Another major contributor to the field is Mary Ann Sagaria. In 1988, she edited the “New Directions for Student Services” volume on leadership development strategies and empowering women, contributing a chapter (with Johnsrud) on generative leadership. She presented a paper on determinants of academic administrators’ job change in 1982; her 1985 article addressed the similarities and differences of male and female educational administrators. In 1988 she authored another article on administrative mobility and gender. Sagaria joined Johnsrud again in 1992 to write about the impact of gender on administrative promotion within the university.

Judith Touchton and Donna Shavlik wrote in 1978, "Challenging the Assumptions of Leadership: Women and Men of the Academy," which urged a move away from administrative training programs for women as a panacea and encouraged instead the recognition of already qualified women. Touchton and Shavlik also joined Lynn Davis to produce a 1993 book presenting a descriptive study on women in college and university presidencies. Touchton had previously authored the Fact Book on Women in Education with Davis in 1991. Touchton and Shavlik also produced a chapter on women as leaders in Green’s 1988 book, Leaders for a New Era: Strategies for Higher Education.

Adrian Tinsley helped edit a "New Directions for Higher Education" volume focusing on women in higher education administration (Tinsley, Secor, and Kaplan,


Joyce Crouch and Mary Powell (1983) provided a view of the academic supervisor's leadership style, male and female, and how that is perceived by subordinates in their paper, "Sex, Sex Role Identity, Leadership Style and Job Satisfaction." In 1984, Crystal Gips with others asked the question "Can Women Bat Clean-Up, or Must They Simply Do the Cleaning? A Look at Women as Organizational Team Players," offering findings of their study which focused on the concept of "team player" among women in
managerial positions in colleges and universities, and among their immediate supervisors. Jean Stokes (1984) analyzed obstacles for women in higher education administration with "Organizational Barriers and Their Impact on Women in Higher Education" and in (1986) "Deficiencies Among Women: A Compelling but Faulty Premise for Professional Development." Ruth Cimperman (1986) wrote about the self-perceptions of female post-secondary educational administrators regarding leadership behavior, and in particular examined how those self-perceptions might vary with the self-perceptions of male administrators in similar settings. In 1988, Joan Fobbs presented her paper, "Barriers and Biases toward Women: Impediments to Administrative Progression," including results of a study of a perceived managerial style and leadership skill of female two-year college presidents. Wanda Gill, alone and with others, examined different leadership issues for women in higher education administration with these studies: "Directors' Self-Appraisal of Leadership Situations" (Gill, 1986); "The Cinderella Concept of the Black Female in Higher Education" (Gill and Showell, 1991); and "Perception of Advocacy Issues of Women Versus Men" (Gill, 1992).

Patricia Turner Mitchell (1993) edited *Cracking the Wall: Women in Higher Education Administration*, which presented a dozen chapters written by women in administration. The book is described as follows in its preface:

This book is about change – change that is personal as well as institutional. It is about change that has already occurred, and change that is still needed if women are to be full participants in higher education and the leadership of higher education institutions. (p.vi)
Review of key theories and findings  Throughout the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s, the literature presented profile and status reports of the women in school and higher educational administration (e.g., Etaugh, 1985; Moore and Salimbene, 1981; Touchton & Shavlick, 1978; Twale, 1992). These updates served to inform the readers of the numbers of women in administrative positions in higher education, often pointing out that the numbers were proportionately unacceptable. The updates also gave more details on the types of administrative positions women were likely to hold, usually stating that women were concentrated in a small number of fields in the social sciences, letters and arts. The administrative woman was likely to be found at a four-year private college or a two-year college, and was paid less than the administrative male in similar positions.

By the mid-1970s, studies by Touchton & Shavlick (1978), Graham (1974), Milner, King, & Pizzini (1979), and Gappa & Uehling (1979), suggested that females in leadership positions have characteristics similar to men, that the assumed differences between male and female leaders are not supported by the data, and that no particular gender was better suited to leadership positions. These assumed differences had followed the commonly accepted gender-typing practice which existed throughout business, social science and society: men are more task-oriented, assertive, unemotional; women are more sensitive, emotional, considerate, in need of affiliation, and usually seeking consensus. Although studies began to proliferate which challenged these assumptions, the assumptions persisted throughout the 1970s (and 1980s) nonetheless.

Some writers such as Fobbs (1988) suggested that women would be better served by adopting more of a "male" management style; Korabik (1982) carried this further and
urged a "blending" of male and female management traits (the theory of androgyny) to be most successful. Some of those who lamented the underrepresentation of women in educational administration presented a solution involving training; train women to think and act like men, and they will be selected for the administrative positions. Touchton & Shavlick (1978), Moore & Sagaria (1981), and Dohrmann (1982) began to argue that training programs were not the answer; visibility and selection were. They contended that qualified women in the field were already out there who did not need training to be selected - they just needed to be selected. The concept of networking was introduced and encouraged (Tinsley, 1985; Kaplan & Helly, 1984). Women supporting women became a motto, of course also reflecting the maturation of feminism and the woman's movement during the decade.

In the 1980s, an interesting mix of theories and findings emerged, perhaps serving as a mirror of the self-analysis and struggle women in America were going through at the time. Kaplan & Helly (1984), Moore (1984), and Fobbs (1988) suggested that socialization had most negatively impacted women's ability to earn administrative positions in educational administration, including findings which stated that women themselves were internalizing society's attitudes and hence believing they were inappropriate for administrative positions. Some, like Dohrmann (1982) and Tinsley (1985), presented the idea that personal and family constraints were negatively affecting a woman's ability to secure an administrative position in the academy; others suggested those constraints as exactly the reasons why a woman could not be an effective
administrator. Some researchers in the field pointed out that now that women could finally learn how to work like men, they were criticized for being "unfeminine."

A number of studies examined issues of leadership style, self-perception and job satisfaction, and some looked at subordinate satisfaction on the job (Korabik, 1982; Crouch & Powell, 1983; Mark; 1984; Fobbs, 1988). In Gips and others (1984), females were found to be perceived more as team players than had been suggested earlier, but still possessing a need for affiliation. Other studies found that women administrators in fact perceived themselves as more "masculine" than male administrators perceived themselves, while at the same time acknowledging more affirmatively their perception of themselves as more "feminine."

The training solution did not disappear. Many programs developed across the country that addressed specifically the needs of women who were seeking administrative positions and administrative growth in the academy. Still some argued, with varying degrees of persuasion, that the question was no longer, "do women have the necessary managerial skills to make it in educational administration?" but rather, "can the women fit in the male's world and be accepted?" (Fobbs, 1988, p. 3).

By the late 1980s, studies of leaders in higher education administration such as Cimperman's (1986), continued to suggest that overall leadership behaviors and attitudes were the same among male and female heads, but the need to reach consensus and build community was still associated with women leaders. Some began to proclaim that this need was good. Frasher & Frasher (1979) had proposed that women were actually the better choices for educational administrative appointments because of their different
leadership characteristics, their propensity to build teams and their sensitivity to workplace conditions. A continuum seems to develop with authors’ findings: a woman moved from being an inappropriate choice for educational administrative positions, to being equally as qualified as a man, to being a more successful leader in an educational setting.

As the new millennium unfolds, so do the advanced gender studies and leadership research. Women are still presented as being underrepresented in higher education administration. Educational administrators are sometimes described not by their sex, but by their behavior (ex. Type A) and their leadership philosophy. Others suggest that the country's move toward mass education (defined by Trow, 1973) as well as toward a more multicultural approach means that women, who are theorized to be more focused on nurturing and consensus-building, are ideal choices to help shape post secondary institutions to address today's needs. Many are examining the role of the organization as it impacts the growth (or perceived control of growth) of women in higher education administration, supporting the theory that effective management in higher education institutions is influenced by organizational culture.

The above literature contributors, theories and findings (and many other works) are further reviewed and integrated through this synthesis. A review of the literature collectively allows a more comprehensive approach to interpretations and conclusions that result from the various findings reported in the literature.

Method

Data collection for this synthesis consists of a thorough literature review subject
to intense scrutiny and selection. In order to control, as much as is reasonably possible, for the quality and relevance of the material included in the literature review, the primary sources are United States-based refereed journals; periodicals and newspapers of note in higher education or the related fields; pertinent books, association reports/newsletters, and monographs; lectures or presentations at recognized national or regional meetings or by recognized researchers or scholars. Dissertations were not included, although some studies refer to the findings of related dissertations. These materials are expected to be reasonably accessible to allow for the ready consultation of primary sources as desired. The information extracted from these materials is related specifically to the research questions posed; therefore, findings and conclusions on women in higher education administration regarding the following were gathered: career paths; role model influences; role of socialization; barriers to career growth; definitions of leadership; leadership characteristics; influence of personal values; subordinate satisfaction; and decision-making traits.

Empirical studies providing data regarding women in higher education administration are included. All empirical studies referenced in the synthesis analyzed the study type (case, qualitative, quantitative), the institution type (public, private, two-year, four-year) and the number (N) of institutions and/or individuals studied. The findings and conclusions of these empirical studies are also subject to the framework described above for extraction of relevant information. Other literature examined include non-empirical studies, related narratives (including some biographical review), and analyses of previous research.
Library collections serve as the major source for the data collection. Computerized catalog searches and ERIC searches provide most of the literature leads. The literature reviewed was located either as a microfilmed or microfiched document, and in many cases the actual book/periodical/journal/report was consulted. A small portion of the literature was retrieved from the Internet.

As stated throughout this chapter, the purpose of the synthesis is the integration of the literature over time. Therefore, a systematic review of the literature serves as the primary method for drawing conclusions about the collective findings reported.
CHAPTER II

WOMEN ADMINISTRATORS IN HIGHER EDUCATION FROM 1970 TO 1999

This synthesis focuses on women in higher education administration, and the content of this chapter serves as context for the synthesis. It presents profiles of female enrollments in colleges and universities, as well as of female administrators. By the presentation of these demographics, this chapter sets the stage to understand the status of women in higher education during the latter part of the twentieth century. This understanding is necessary before systematic review of the literature regarding career advancement and leadership characteristics of female administrators can take place. Although researchers on the topic of women administrators may have pursued their studies for a variety of reasons, all were focused, directly or indirectly, on where females had been, where they were now, and where they were going in the field of higher education administration.

It is also important to consider a context for the timeframe of this synthesis, 1970 to 1999. From the advent of civil rights in the 1970s to sexual harassment cases in the 1990s, matters of equity and self awareness faced women repeatedly. Dohrmann (1982) reports that “Although women are 22% of all managers and administrators in the United States, the number of women managers is not proportionate to the number of women in
the workforce" (p. 1). Further, only 15 women headed major corporations at that time, as opposed to 2500 men. In 1988, the total number of women in the workforce employed in executive, administrative and managerial occupations was 39 percent. Although that number increased to 43 percent in 1996, they accounted for less than three to five percent of the top executive positions (U. S. Department of Labor Women's Bureau, April 1997). Women in higher education reflect a similar status. In 1985, only 35 percent of the full-time executives, managers, or administrators in higher education were women (Bax, 1996). Yet females have constituted 51 percent of the total U. S. population since 1960 (Touchton and Davis, 1991), and since 1979 women have comprised more than half of higher education's student enrollment (Ottinger and Sikula, 1993).

Flynn (1993) states:

When legislation began opening the doors for women there weren't many in higher education prepared to step into those leadership roles. The paths women take into higher education frequently don't prepare them to be considered for an administrative post... Historically there has been a lack of awareness among women that leadership roles were potential avenues for them. Therefore they did not prepare themselves or show tremendous interest in getting administrative positions (p. 118).

Yet McDonald (1979) declares, "By 1970, the seeds of change that had been planted in the previous decade took root and caused women on campuses everywhere to begin to take stock of their educational and professional potential... Women faculty and administrators began to articulate ways to improve their status within their professions"
This chapter provides a summary of the data and demographics as reported in the literature on women in higher education administration from 1970 to 1999. It will demonstrate that women have moved up the ranks of higher education administration with some success. This movement starts, however, with the increase in female enrollments at the nation's colleges and universities.

Female enrollments in colleges and universities

Since the 1970s, college-age women (originally defined as 18- to 24-year olds) of all racial/ethnic backgrounds have completed high school at higher rates than their male counterparts. Women have comprised more than half of all students enrolled at colleges and universities since 1979, and their share of college enrollment has continued to increase (Ottinger & Sikula, 1993). In 1980, 6.2 million women were enrolled in institutions of higher education; by 1990, that total had increased to 7.8 million women. Females represented 55 percent of the nation's 14.1 million college students in 1990; at two-year institutions, women comprised 57 percent of the students enrolled, and at four-year institutions, 53 percent of the students were women. Forty-four percent of the women attending college in 1990 were age 25 or older (Ottinger & Sikula, 1993). In 1997, 70 percent of female high school graduates immediately enrolled in a two- or four-year college (Hebel, 2000).

In 1980, women earned 54 percent of all associate degrees awarded. That proportion increased to 58 percent in 1990, and in 1994, 59.2 percent of all associate degrees were earned by women (Ottinger & Sikula, 1993; "The Chronicle of Higher
Education,” June 28, 1996).

Women earned more than half of all bachelor’s degrees awarded in 1982, the first time males fell below 50 percent. By 1990, the number of bachelor’s degrees earned by females was 25 percent higher than those earned in 1980 (Ottinger & Sikula, 1993). Women of color earned 14 percent of all bachelor’s degrees awarded to females in 1990; more than half (54 percent) of all the bachelor’s degrees earned by women were concentrated in four fields: business/management (21 percent), education (15 percent), health sciences (9 percent) and social sciences (9 percent) (Ottinger & Sikula, 1993). By 1993, females made up 56 percent of all undergraduates (45 percent of these women were over age 24), and they earned 54 percent of all bachelor’s degrees awarded in 1992-93 (Knopp, 1995). In 1996, women earned 55 percent of all bachelor’s degrees (American Council on Education, September 2000).

Women also made significant strides in graduate level coursework and degrees. In 1970, female students represented 39 percent of graduate students (Hebel, 2000). By 1981, females earned 50 percent of the master’s degrees awarded. Since 1986, women have earned more than half of all degrees conferred at the master’s level. In 1990, females earned 53 percent of the master’s degrees awarded; most of the masters they earned were in three fields: education (38 percent), business (15 percent) and health professions (9 percent). Women of color in 1990 earned 12 percent of the master’s degrees awarded (Ottinger & Sikula, 1993). By 1994, women earned 54.5 percent of all master’s degrees awarded; in particular they earned 76.7 percent of all education master’s degrees awarded (“Chronicle of Higher Education,” June 28, 1996). In 1996, female students represented
56 percent of all graduate students (Hebel, 2000).

Females did not stop at the level of master's degrees in their quest for credentialing and the attainment of greater knowledge. Syverson (1998) reports that in 1976, the number of United States women Ph.D. recipients was 6,842, or 25 percent of the share of earned doctorates. In 1978, women had earned 27 percent of all U.S. doctorates awarded that year (“The Monthly Forum on Women in Higher Education,” January 1996). By 1993, that total increased to 38 percent (Knopp, 1995) and to more than 47 percent (National Opinion Research Center, 1999) in 1998. Figures from 1991 present a clearer picture of which females were pursuing doctoral degrees: white women comprised the majority of females earning Ph.D's (88 percent); women of color comprised only 5 percent of all doctorates awarded; the three top fields for American women earning Ph.D's were education, social sciences, and humanities (Ottinger & Sikula, 1993). It is important to note that in 1998, women had earned approximately 63 percent of all doctorates in education that were awarded; in 1978, women had earned just under 40 percent of all doctorates in education (National Opinion Research Center, 1999). Among all females earning Ph.Ds in 1994, 46.8 percent of them planned on working at an educational institution after receiving their degree (“The Monthly Forum on Women in Higher Education,” January 1996).

Witmer (1995) asks a most obvious question in reviewing the growth of females earning so many degrees: "...since studies reveal that women are increasingly receiving a greater percentage of master's degrees and doctoral degrees in educational administration, shouldn't we expect to see a proportionate number of women gaining administrative
positions?" (p. xxi) Flynn's declaration in 1993 reiterates this problem:

The factors that have kept women from preparing for and getting administrative positions have diminished over the past 10 years. There is more receptive attitude towards women in leadership positions. But despite the gains women have made in terms of advanced degrees awarded to them, women still constitute a small minority of faculty and administrators in institutions of higher education. (p. 120)

Numbers and Positions of Female Administrators

Less than one quarter of all the full-time higher education executives, managers or administrators in the mid 1970s were women. In 1985, this number had increased to 35 percent (Bax, 1996); in 1991, the number was 40 percent (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 1991); and in 1997, 45 percent of the full-time executives, managers or administrators were women (National Center for Education Statistics, 1999).

Other research presented less positive data about female administrators, often because the focus of the studies was on the particular positions the females held. In 1972, according to Astin (1977), women comprised 13.7 percent of all deans in over 1800 institutions. Of these, 60 percent were in nursing and home economics. While there were two female law school deans, there were no women deans of dentistry, engineering, medicine or pharmacy. In 1978, there were still no women deans of dentistry, engineering, medicine, or pharmacy, and women held 13.4 percent of the deanships in public white coeducational institutions and 15.2 percent at private white coeducational institutions (Frances and Mensel, 1981). According to Heim (1978), women in 1975-76 accounted for 62 percent of the academic library workforce, yet white men predominated
as head librarians in all institutions except white women's private colleges and minority public and private colleges. Moore (1984) reports that 13.8 percent of the deanships in 1981 were held by women; over half of these women held the positions in nursing, home economics, arts and sciences, and continuing education. Moore also reports that the administrative positions most frequently held by women and minorities were registrar, librarian and director of financial aid.

Touchton & Davis (1991) presents a picture of the leadership positions women administrators had come to hold in 1987. They summarize, "Women administrators are more likely to be found in student affairs and external affairs than in academic and administrative affairs. At the highest positions in all these areas, however, women are greatly outnumbered by men." (p. 16). In 1987, 27 percent of the deans in academic areas were females. The range within this percentage indicates the minimal change in women's leadership status since the 1970s: the high was 97 percent women for deans of nursing to the low of 8 percent for deans of law. In nursing and home economics, females held more than one-half of the senior positions. Other categories of administration which had a high percentage of women included: director of affirmative action (59 percent), manager of payroll (71 percent), director of publications (59 percent) and director of student placement (53 percent). Touchton & Davis (1991) also explain:

The proportion of women administrators increases at lower levels of the organization. For example, in Admissions offices in 1987, women held 28 percent of the Director of Admissions positions, 50 percent of the Associate Director positions, and 66 percent of the Assistant Director positions (p. 16).
Chapman and Urbach (1984) also report on the admission field, noting that women held approximately 21 percent of the director positions in 1979-80, and that number remained fairly constant through 1982-83.

Clarke (1988) offers a specific institutional example of the overall weak representation of females in senior administrative ranks. She reports that of the more than 1,500 positions in mid- and upper-level management which were available at that time at Duke, 906 (59 percent) were held by women. However, fewer than 8 percent of those women managers and administrators were at a senior level. Drum (1993) reports that in 1992, 29 percent of the vice presidents of student affairs/student services/student life were women. In 1997, of the 111 NCAA Division 1-A schools, only six had employed a female athletic director ("Women in Higher Education," April 1997). "In fact, there are more women college presidents in each of NCAA's three competitive divisions than there are female athletic directors over both men's and women's programs" ("About Women on Campus," 1997, Winter, p. 6). According to Acosta and Carpenter (1992), "In 1972, more than 90% of women's programs were directed by a female. In 1992 only 16.81% of women's intercollegiate programs were under the supervision of a female head athletic director" (p. 9).

The College and University Personnel Association (CUPA) annually survey institutions across the country to determine administrator and salary trends in higher education. They also provide details about the status of female administrators. The 1975-76 CUPA employment survey identified 52 administrative positions (excluding assistant directorships) and surveyed 2,723 higher education institutions about these positions;
1,037 institutions responded. White men held about 79 percent of the administrative positions at the survey institutions; white women held 14 percent and minority women held under two percent (Van Alstyne, Withers, and Elliott, 1977). A special report for CUPA on employment patterns in 1978-79 indicates that one-quarter of the white women employed as top-level administrators at public white coeducational institutions held one of four positions: Dean of Nursing, Director of Library Services, Bookstore Manager, or Registrar (Frances and Mensel, 1981). The 1995 CUPA “Administrative Compensation Survey” reports that 35 percent of the chief admissions officers were women, and 57 percent of the associate directors were women. That same survey found that women held 48 percent of the administrative positions in external affairs and 47 percent of administrative positions in student services in 1994-95. More specifically, it indicates that women represented 31 percent of the chief student affairs officers, 29 percent of the chief development officers, 25 percent of the chief academic officers, and 13 percent of the chief business officers (Knopp, 1995).

Female Administrators in Public, Private and Single-Sex Institutions

Some differences in degree of representation by women administrators were reported among the public, private and single-sex institutions of higher learning. Etaugh (1985) states, "In 1978, women generally were more likely to hold major administrative offices in private, co-educational institutions than in public ones" (p. 6). Yet the first woman to head a collegiate institution was appointed to a public college in 1872, according to Tisinger, 1992.

Not surprisingly, women’s colleges present the most positive picture regarding
female administrators. The 1975-76 College and University Personnel Association employment survey found that women held 52 percent of the administrative jobs surveyed at women's colleges, a share of employment almost four times as great as the 14 percent at white coeducational colleges. However, white men held more than two-thirds of the chief executive positions and the top-level positions in administrative affairs at women's colleges, as well as nearly half of all other types of administrative positions — except for positions in student and external affairs, where over 60 to 80 percent of them were held by women. Howard (1978) conducted a survey in 1976 of 588 colleges and universities that found that at least half of all deans were women in two-thirds of the women's colleges. In 1983, women's colleges averaged 3 women administrators on staff, while co-educational institutions averaged 0.9 women administrators per institution (“On Campus with Women,” Spring 1985).

Regarding the public sector, Arter's survey (1972) reports that in 1970-71 over one-half of the state universities and land-grant colleges did not have women in top-level administrative positions. The median number of males in top-level administration was eighteen, while the median number of females was zero. Oltman (1972) reported that in 1970 women represented three percent of the presidents of public colleges and universities, zero percent of the vice presidents, nine percent of the deans of students, and eight percent of the academic deans. By 1987, Warner & DeFleur (1993) reported that approximately 22 percent of administrators at state and land-grant institutions were women.

The comparison of public and private institution data reported about women
administrators presents some interesting contrasts. Frances & Mensel (1981) summarized that the changes in employment patterns of women in over 50 top-level administrative positions were minimal between 1975 and 1978, but more changes occurred in the private sector. Touchton and Davis (1991) found that of all administrative positions listed in 1987, women held 41 percent of the positions in private four year institutions and 30 percent in public four year institutions. In public two year institutions, the female administrators held 36 percent of the positions and in two year private institutions, that number was 48 percent.

Faulwell and Gordon (1985) analyzed a 1983 survey of the membership of the American Conference of Academic Deans. They found that female administrators were more likely to work at small private institutions than male administrators; while the majority of all the respondents to the survey (75 percent) were employed by private institutions, 90 percent of those who worked at public institutions were male. For public institutions, more of the male respondents (29.1 percent) were employed at these institutions than female respondents (11.8 percent). They also found among the 306 responses that no female administrators were employed at institutions with more than 15,000 students.

However, Konrad and Pfeffer (1991) utilized data on 821 educational institutions from the 1978 and 1983 College and University Personnel Association (CUPA) Administrative Compensation Survey and found that women and minorities are more likely to be hired as administrators in public rather than private institutions. Warner and DeFleur (1993) report findings from a recent survey of 394 administrators at the dean and
above level in all types of higher education institutions. Most administrators in their sample were employed at comprehensive universities, liberal arts colleges, and community colleges; they found from the sample that type of institution did not differ significantly between women and men. Male and female administrators were also found in relatively equal proportions at public and private institutions. What did differ was gender representation by position level: men were significantly more likely to be in senior level positions than women.

Women of Color in Administration

It is apparent from the data collected that a significant disparity exists in the ranks of women administrators when race is factored in. In 1979, excluding positions at historically black or single-sex institutions, minority women held less than one percent of the 7,000 posts existing at the level of dean and above ("Chronicle of Higher Education," February 3, 1982). By 1985, 35 percent of all full-time administrators in higher education were women, but 86 percent of these women were white/non-Hispanic; ten percent were Black, two percent Latina, two percent Asian, and less than one percent were Native American. By 1987, minority women represented ten percent of all women administrators (Touchton & Davis, 1991). Ottinger & Sikula (1993) present a ten year summary which indicates that women of color administrators more than doubled from 1981 to 1991, from 4,288 to 8,742 administrators. However, the increase did not lead to a proportional jump in the share of women full-time administrators who were minorities. In 1981 the share was four percent; that share was just six percent in 1991. Among the women of color administrators, eleven percent were African-American, three percent were Hispanic, two
percent were Asian-American, and less than one-half of one percent were American Indian.

Female Presidents

Perhaps the most commonly examined statistic regarding female administrators in higher education reports the number of women presidents of colleges/universities. The American Council on Education first began collecting data on presidents of colleges in 1975 ("About Women on Campus," Fall 1992) although Astin (1977) reported that there were 132 women presidents in 1972. In 1975, that number was 148 women, which constituted five percent of all the nation's presidencies. Of the 148 female presidents, 132 were employed by private institutions and 16 worked at public institutions (Touchton & Davis, 1991). The majority of women presidents at that time were members of religious orders: 55 percent according to Touchton & Davis (1991); the American Council on Education (1982) puts this number at 71 percent.

By 1980 the number of female college presidents had grown to 219 (Touchton, Shavlick & Davis, 1993), and to 253 in 1983 (Etaugh, 1985). ACE (1982) reports that the majority of women presidents in 1983 were employed by private four-year colleges (58 percent), nearly half of which were women's colleges; 42 percent were members of religious orders. Of these presidents, 17 were women of color (Shavlick & Touchton, 1984).

A year later, the 253 women presidents grew to number 286 (Knopp, 1995), which represented ten percent of all presidencies. The percentage of women presidents who were members of religious orders continued to decline, dropping to 35 percent in
1986 ("Women in Higher Education," August 1994). Of that 286, 182 were found at private institutions and 104 at public institutions ("Women in Higher Education" Web site). By 1989, women represented 11 percent of college presidencies, totaling 328 female presidents. There were 182 women heading private institutions and 146 heading public institutions. Members of a religious order comprised 23 percent of the total number of women presidents; and of all women presidents, 13 percent were of color (Touchton & Davis, 1991).

From 1975 to 1995, the number of women ascending to presidencies had tripled, from 148 to 453 women. This 1995 number represents 16 percent of the total presidencies (2,903) identified by ACE at that time. Most of these women are white (84 percent); most head institutions with full-time enrollments less than 3,000 (71 percent); and 44 percent of the women presidents are employed by four-year private institutions as opposed to the 17 percent heading four-year public institutions (the remaining 39 percent are presidents of two-year institutions, both public and private) (American Council on Education, 1995). Ross, Green & Henderson report in 1993 that seven percent of research university presidencies were occupied by women.

By 1998, the share of presidencies held by women reached 19.3 percent. At two-year colleges, the share is 22.4 percent and at doctoral universities, it is 13.2 percent. Presidencies held by members of minority groups increased to 11.3 percent in 1998, and they are most heavily represented at public institutions (Lively, 2000b). Six percent of all presidencies in 1998 were held by female African Americans, three percent by female Hispanics, one percent by female Asian Americans and one percent by female Native
Discussion

On the basis of numerical statistics alone, there has been growth in the representation of women among higher education’s administrative positions. It is important, however, to understand the sources and accuracy of the statistics. The American Council on Education (ACE), the U.S. Department of Education, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) and the National Research Council are agencies that report statistical data about college enrollment, degree recipients, and higher education administrators, and the data is frequently cited in many of the authors’ studies included in this synthesis (Hemming, 1982; Etaugh, 1985; Touchton and Davis, 1991; Ross, et al.1993; Warner and DeFleur, 1993; Knopp, 1995), as well as in relevant newsletters (“Women in Higher Education,” “On Campus with Women,” “The Monthly Forum on Women in Higher Education”) and the “Chronicle of Higher Education.” This data appears to be the most accurate among that presented in the literature; significantly high representation of all higher education institutions is presented, the studies are consistently repeated (generally on an annual basis) and the methodology remains fairly constant. The College and University Personnel Association (CUPA) annual study, and special studies on administrators on which it has collaborated, are also cited (Rickard, 1992; Heim, 1978; Konrad and Pfeffer, 1991; Knopp, 1995). However, they do not have representation from a significantly high proportion of all higher education institutions, and the administrative positions that are examined do not always include associate/assistant director level positions. Chief or director-level positions only are
examined in earlier CUPA studies, and it is documented that the number of positions included in CUPA data has increased in recent decades. Touchton and Davis' (1991) Fact Book on Women also includes what appears to be a very thorough and accurate picture of female administrators in higher education, although they, too, tap ACE and CUPA data.

Throughout the literature, findings from smaller samples are presented. While the proportion of female higher education administrators is also small compared to that of males, some of the samples are still rather limited. Often this is due to the focus of the study. Arter (1972), for instance, investigates the role of women in the administration of state universities and land-grant colleges only. Heim (1978) examines data strictly related to academic librarians. In investigating the likelihood of a "glass ceiling" for women administrators, Clarke (1988) looks only at administrative positions at Duke University. Shere (1990) examines data on admission directors, and Acosta and Carpenter (1992) review female administrators in intercollegiate athletics.

In some cases, studies are presumed to have a statistically valid sample but are still small. Etaugh (1985), for instance, cites studies previously completed that included a sample of 588 and 1222 colleges and universities, which obviously suggest that the entire population of higher education institutions were not surveyed. Rickard (1992) also cites studies, including 1,587 and 1,402 institutional responses in separate years, again suggesting smaller samples. Warner and DeFleur (1993) present data from their study consisting of 394 administrators in all types of institutions of higher education. Data from 821 educational institutions was utilized by Konrad and Pfeffer (1991), and Oltman (1972) included 454 four-year institutions in her study.
Other studies base their samples on membership lists only. Arter (1972) utilizes the 118 member institution list of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges; Faulwell and Gordon (1985) conducted their survey of the membership of the American Conference of Academic Deans. Readers of this literature are expected to accept that these membership lists represent a significantly high proportion of the relevant populations.

While this synthesis did not seek to limit the female administrators in higher education to a particular level, some studies throughout the literature do place such a limitation. One study, “Women and Minorities in Administration of Higher Education Institutions” (1981), in fact examines only “top-level” administrative positions (i.e., 81 positions were covered by the study.) The CUPA annual survey of 1975-76 identified 52 administrative positions, which excluded assistant directorships. Rickard’s (1992) study focuses on 12 positions (six chief administrative officers and six director-level positions). Ross, et al. (1993), as well as Touchton, Shavlick and Davis (1993), focus their research efforts only on female presidents of higher education institutions.

Also, some studies pull data from previous studies, all of which were not easily accessible (Mark, 1986; Knopp, 1995).

Ebaugh states in 1985, “Comparisons over time are difficult to make since studies done at different times have not used the same data bases” (p. 6). In reviewing the progress of women in higher education administration, her caution should be heeded. This chapter seeks to present a contextual status profile of women in higher education administration, and while it focuses primarily on statistical data, any generalizations
should be carefully drawn from review of the studies. Repeated studies that have consistently focused on certain positions, or utilized constant methodology, offer the greater likelihood of fair conclusions to be drawn. For instance, it can be argued that the number of female presidents in higher education institutions has steadily increased since 1970, and that female enrollments in colleges and universities have now surpassed that of males. Also clear is the steady progress women have made in earning baccalaureate, master’s and doctoral degrees. It does appear that women are more regularly represented at lower administrative levels than at top levels in college and university administration, although there seem to be more studies directed toward higher level administrative positions (especially in academic administration), and less toward non-academic administrative positions at all levels.

Outside of the statistical analysis, there is another relevant area of a more subjective nature: has the growth in representation of women in higher education administration been large enough and quick enough? Researchers such as Van Alstyne, et al. (1977), Etaugh (1985) and Ottinger and Sikula (1993) pose this question, directly and indirectly. It is certainly a subjective question, particularly when one notes that most writers on the subject of women educational administrators have been women (less than 20 percent of the sources cited in this synthesis included a male author). ACE released findings from its "Campus Trends 1993" survey (figures are based on responses to the survey which was sent to senior administrators at 510 colleges and universities in Winter 1993; response rate was 80 percent); among the survey results were the percentages of individuals who felt their institution rated "excellent/very good" or "adequate/poor" in the
representation of women among senior administrators. A total of 33 percent rated their institutions as "excellent" or "very good;" 42 percent rated them as "adequate" or "poor". Ottinger & Sikula (1993) declare in their study, "Finally, the data clearly demonstrate an interest in education and achievement on the part of all women, yet women's share of leadership, economic rewards and a variety of professions remains unfulfilled" (no pagination). Witmer (1995) declares emphatically:

Women are not moving up the career ladder in education. Even in a time of growing awareness of diversity and gender bias, the percentage of women in administrative posts has not increased. Much discussion has taken place over the past twenty-five years about the need to increase the number of women in leadership positions, yet the rate now appears to be at a standstill (p. xx).
CHAPTER III
CAREER PATHS OF WOMEN IN HIGHER EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION

Common Career Paths

The literature that examines the career paths of women in higher education administration tends to examine common components in career pathing: the entry level position which begins the career; the various positions of increasing responsibility and authority pursued during a career; and the attainment of the position which represents the pinnacle of professional success (presumed to be higher, or highest, up on the career ladder that an individual began ascending when he/she assumed the entry level position). In particular, it focuses on academic preparation, faculty experience leading to administrative duty, and the “time-in-line” approach (career mobility effected by movement through fixed positions, a series of appointments with increasing levels of responsibility). The literature is inclined, with varying degrees of deliberateness, to distinguish between academic and non-academic administrative positions in its analyses. Kreps (1974), Murrel and Donohue (1982), Ironside (1983), Evans (1985) and Hill and Ragland (1995), among others, observe that female administrators do little career planning or strategizing as they set out on their paths. Paul, Sweet and Brigham (1980) have also suggested that there could be a common career path for men and women to follow on the way to a position of authority in higher education administration, especially
academic administration. This path is generally described as beginning with a faculty position, moving into an administrative position and then ascending up the administrative ladder by securing administrative positions of increasing responsibility. But for a number of reasons, it suggests that women do not necessarily follow this path. Often, barriers are cited which are presumed to prevent women from taking this course.

Yet, the studies of women in higher education administration vary in their assessment of exactly what path these women have followed. For example, Ironside (1983) also points to college teaching as a common starting point, followed by the pursuit of the doctorate, then attainment of administrative experience, as a career path choice for women. Kreps (1974) on the other hand reports that women will often go into college teaching but then fail to advance. The typical male career path in higher education administration adheres to the time-in-line experience approach, but Twalec (1992) declares this path to be a barrier to a woman's career mobility. She suggests women to be more successful in advancing their career by working at institutions with more flexible hierarchical structures. Warner and DeFleur (1993) report academic affairs as appearing to have the most streamlined path to the top, but also report that women tend to be clustered more in the non-academic areas of higher education institutions, and thus are restricted to that career path.

A common career path for women in higher education administration may not clearly exist, however. Freeman (1977) studied top level women administrators in Washington D.C. higher education institutions, and reports, "It is apparent that no particular academic route could be drawn from the patterns of the administrators. They
chose very different pathways” (p. 12). Moore and Sagaria (1981) found in their study sample that “no single career ladder predominates, and that no single position such as department chairperson is likely to be a better launchpad to top positions” (p. 34).

Findings of a study Donohue (1981) conducted include the determination that career paths varied for the women studied; “no one career stage was reported” (p. 5) by all of the female respondents. Donohue also deduces that for a woman to become a senior-level administrator in state-supported institutions, no prior career experience appears to be a prerequisite (although middle-level administrative experience was most common among the respondents). A study by Murrell and Donohue (1982) finds, “No specific educational degree, field of study, prior title, or age appears to be necessary for women to become senior-level administrators in four-year, coeducational, state-supported institutions of higher education.” Evans (1985) reports from her qualitative study, “No one career pattern could be identified” (p. 7) among the sample of women.

Moore (1984) offers the reminder that “many elements combine to form a career in administration and that colleges and universities plan a controlling, structuring role in the definition, duration, and outcome of administrative careers” (p. 14). Ironside (1983) concludes that “positions of administrative leadership in higher education can be attained via pathways not totally within academe” (p. 15).

Any discussion of women’s career paths in higher education administration must begin with the attainment of a college degree. As stated in the previous chapter profiling women in higher education administration, women’s share in college enrollment has continued to increase. More than 50 percent of bachelor’s and master’s degrees awarded
by 1993 were awarded to women; 38 percent of all doctorates were earned by women. In 1996, women had earned approximately 62 percent of all doctorates in education.

Equipped with credentials, females entered the U.S. workforce in greater numbers as the last chapter of the 20th century unfolded. The literature reveals that indeed a number of these college-educated women did move into higher education administration.

Selecting the field of education as a career in the 1970s and early 1980s for women may have represented societal pressure as much as individuals’ interests. Kreps (1974) makes the observation that females appeared to choose their disciplines within perceived role expectations, pursuing college teaching, for instance, in areas where they faced the least competition from men. Moore and Sagaria’s (1981) study supported the theory that females were still clustered in the “traditional” fields such as teaching and nursing. Barrax (1985) conducted a qualitative study of women and men who had achieved similar administrative positions in a university setting; she reports that several of the female respondents began their academic careers in gender-typed fields such as nursing, but then went on to earn terminal degrees in somewhat less gender-typed fields (citing higher education administration as an example).

As more studies examined the profiles of higher education administrators, a pronounced difference between the educational backgrounds of male and female administrators was uncovered. It began with the level of degree attained; Paul, Sweet and Brigham (1980) point to the findings of their study of community college administrators in Massachusetts, which suggest that the females stopped at the requisite master’s degree while the males had surpassed it. “Most of the male presidents and many of the male
deans have doctoral degrees" (p. 161), they report. "This discrepancy may signal a need for females to obtain the highest degrees to buttress their aspirations to higher status positions. Females can expect to obtain positions of equal status only if they have equal credentials" (p. 161). Moore (1984) also voiced an opinion on the significance of earning a terminal degree:

Women (and others) are disadvantaged if they lack the doctorate, even when competing for the many entry-level administrative positions in today's market. Women seeking top positions should realize that 80 percent of all presidents and provosts hold the doctorate and that 90 percent of the women in such positions have it. (p. 13)

In her national study of higher education administrators, Moore (1983) reports that nearly one-half (49.3 percent) of the males in the sample had earned three degrees compared to one-third (33.5 percent) of the female respondents. The largest percentage of women (40.5 percent) had earned two degrees; 31.3 percent of the males had earned only two degrees.

As the previous chapter has stated, women rose to this challenge, particularly in earning a majority of the doctorates awarded in education. However, it is this very move toward terminal degrees in education that separates the female administrators from the male administrators. Warner and DeFleur (1993) studied 394 administrators at the dean and above level, and found that while the majority of both women (63 percent) and men (66 percent) hold doctoral degrees, the area in which the highest degree was received differed for the women and men. The majority of the women (60 percent) possessed a
doctorate in education, while the men represented more varied backgrounds: 36 percent earned doctorates in education, 17 percent in the social sciences, 11 percent in history/philosophy, 11 percent in the physical sciences, and 11 percent in business. Warner and DeFleur observe that traditionally, most senior administrators have come from one of the liberal arts disciplines. Their study found:

Those with degrees in the social and physical sciences are represented at higher rates than those with degrees in other fields at the most senior level positions. Those from the arts and sciences also show higher representation at the academic dean level. Those with degrees in business and education have greater representation in both of the nonacademic areas. (p. 11)

Warner, Brazell, Allen, Bostick, and Marin (1988), as well as Moore (1984), caution women about the potential disparagement of higher education degrees as not sufficiently academic enough to therefore attain higher level academic posts. Indeed, Warner et al. predicted, “If women continue to seek advanced degrees in the area of education at a higher percentage than men, we may not see significant changes in the distribution of men and women throughout the administrative hierarchy” (p. 8). This attainment of credentials, then, to ensure a steady start in an educational administration career may be complicated by the choice of discipline that women pursue. Wilson (1989) observes, however, that “nearly 30% of male presidents have doctorates in educational administration, not in scientific disciplines. Yet the stereotype that one must have a Ph.D. vs. an Ed.D. to be a president continues to persist” (p. 92). The national study of
community/junior college administrators by Moore, Twombly & Martorana (1985) finds that 50.6 percent of the male respondents had earned the Ed.D. as compared with 36.0 percent of the female respondents who held the Ed. D.

As academic preparation relates to a common career path of women administrators in higher education, it appears that college attendance during their late teens and/or early 20's is a shared experience (Donohue, 1981); most women recognize the need for a higher (preferably terminal) degree, and have earned it; and many have earned their doctorates in education.

The next step on the higher education administration career ladder for women appears to divide in the literature, separating the academic from non-academic administrative posts ultimately attained. Moore and Sagaria (1981) present the generic path of male administrators on their way to academic posts:

After completing a terminal degree and gaining professional experience in a discipline, they achieve tenure and senior status in a department, then move on to be chairman, dean, or provost. Any one or all of the moves may be accompanied by a change of institution. This sequence of experiences constitutes the normative career ladder to top-level positions in academe (p. 28).

Moore and Sagaria (1981) conclude:

Thus, even though individuals may deviate from the model, and even though many more men fit the criteria than are even chosen for top-level posts, nevertheless this particular career ladder has salience both as a
model and as perceived reality. Consequently, it is also the model against which women’s careers in academe can and are being measured (p. 28).

Moore and Sagaria (1981) restate this further as the “classic academic career from B.A. through Ph.D. to faculty position to administration” (p. 33).

Gaining faculty experience is practically a requirement for progression in academic administration ranks, the literature shows. In 1974, Graham recognized this: In the process of academic careers there are (generally) two particularly critical junctures. The first is the transition from graduate student to faculty. The second is from faculty to administration. By no means all faculty members make the shift from teaching to administration, but most top academic administrators have progressed through faculty ranks (p. 238).

Mattfield (1974) concurred, “Many administrators will continue to come from the faculty” (p. 127). Moore and Sagaria (1981) clarify:

...these data suggest that no single career ladder predominates, and that no single position such as department chairperson is likely to be a better launchpad to top positions. However, faculty experience continues to be a prerequisite for most academic positions (p. 34).

Moore and Sagaria also report that the women already in major academic positions have generally conformed to the traditional academic model of career advancement: most have been faculty members, although few have actually headed a department. Fennema and Ayer (1984) affirm, “Most positions related to academic
affairs, however, are held by academicians who are senior professors with established credentials. The route to such positions remains progress through professorial ranks” (p. 235). Warner and DeFleur (1993) go further in their emphasis on faculty experience, and point to the department chair position as a major stepping stone to administration: “Some faculty are chosen by their colleagues to serve as the department chair which is often regarded as the basic foundation for those who want to move into other administrative posts.” Warner, et al. (1988) found that for both men and women, those with faculty experience are significantly more likely to hold administrative positions at universities (55 percent) than those without faculty experience (38 percent). “Those who have had faculty experience are much more likely to be in the highest level of administration as well as in academic dean positions” (p. 8).

Studies also argue that early career choices impact a woman’s career mobility. Donohue’s 1981 study found that a woman’s opportunity to become president, or vice president for academics/fiscal affairs/student affairs seemed to improve if her early career was established in some area of education. Warner, et al. (1988) found that women in nonacademic administrative positions are less likely to have been nominated or recruited for their first administrative positions; Warner and DeFleur (1993) state, “those who start their administrative careers in academic areas are more likely subsequently to attain senior level positions” (p. 15).

The distinction between academic and non-academic administrative posts is highlighted through the statements found in the literature. Graham (1974) indicates that there are many administrative posts for which no faculty experience is required, but that
ordinarily the top academic administrative posts are held by former faculty members. Mattfield (1974) speaks of the student services field and the administrators within it, stating that their vitae will often look no different from members of other administrative offices. However, if they have come from the faculty ranks, Mattfield presumes “they are rarely prolific writers or scholars before or after the move, although they are likely to have distinguished themselves as teachers, tutors, or departmental advisers of some sort before having been refused tenure and offered a substitute post.” She continues, “Some choose to become administrators of this kind directly after receiving the Ph.D. or during work on a dissertation that may never be finished” (p. 122). Mattfield makes a clearer distinction with the following:

The situation for women in top administration is quite different from that for women in student services. The primary officers of universities and colleges have customarily come from the school’s own faculty or the faculty of a comparably prestigious institution and, notably, after many years of teaching and research (p. 123).

Moore and Sagaria’s study (1981) found that among the sample of 180 women administrators they surveyed, 80 percent of the major academic administrators had faculty experience, while only 25.9 percent of the major support administrators had such experience. Moore and Sagaria state:

...in discussions of women’s academic careers, there is frequent speculation whether having had experience or having begun work in a support area, specifically in student personnel, is detrimental to
advancement to top positions. The data on the major academic
respondents indicated that there is some merit to this speculation. Only
two of the 34 major academic four-year college administrators had held
support services positions (p. 33).

Moore and Sagaria allude to the potential development of separate career tracks in recent
years for academic and non-academic administrators. In a later study, Moore (1984)
states, “some career tracks, such as student personnel, appear to be quite hospitable to
women and minority group members, while others, such as academic affairs, have almost
no representation from these groups” (p. 7). Fennema and Ayer (1984) note that there has
been an increase in recent years in the numbers of “non-faculty, academic staff
administrators who do not have faculty credentials but who have achieved higher-level
administrative positions” (p. 235), but they also offer the reminder that most higher-level
academic positions are held by “academicians.”

Shere (1990) examines in-depth the career paths of a specific non-academic
administrative pool, that of female college admission officers, and she reports a variety of
results. The survey group included 266 respondents, and over half of the respondents had
obtained a master’s degree, while nine had earned doctorates. The four most common
degree areas were: counseling, student personnel and student affairs administration,
education, and higher education administration. The percentage of respondents who
pursued admission positions upon graduation was 52 percent. Shere reports: “The second
most common way for women to start a career in admission was through the teaching
profession, with 14 percent of the women entering this way” (p. 19).
Wilson (1989) writes of women of color and their progress in academic administration, noting that many women of color often came into higher education institutions as administrators of programs especially designated for minority students, and "Such programs are less valued in the academy than academic disciplines and rarely lead to upward mobility" (p. 95). Administrative career paths that are clustered in the nonacademic areas of student affairs or other university services, Warner and DeFleur (1993) say, are career paths "more likely to be dead-end or to be on ladders which have low ceilings" (p. 8). Moore (1984) and Shakeshaft (1987) suggest that women are more likely to enter into these nonacademic career paths. Warner and DeFleur also determined, "Administrators without faculty backgrounds are found more often than those with faculty experience in the nonacademic areas, but men are much more likely than women without faculty experience to make it to the senior level nonacademic positions (vice president of divisions)" (p. 13).

This movement from faculty to various administrative posts is also referred to as "time-in-line" experience. Ost and Twale (1989) state,

The formal structures of universities and colleges permit little career mobility through the hierarchical ladders of administration without traditional time-in-line experience. Career mobility in higher education traditionally occurs via movement through fixed positions, a series of appointments with increasing levels of responsibility (p. 24).

They declare that those without time-in-line credentials can only look to nontraditional administrative positions as reasonable career options. Following the time-in-line
approach often means uninterrupted career histories building up to career pinnacles. Ironside’s qualitative study of 30 upper-level administrators (1983) deduced that these women’s long and continuous work histories, while frequently causing personal sacrifices, placed them in better positions to compete with men for career opportunities.

The literature cites other factors impacting career paths of women administrators. Paul, Sweet, and Brigham (1980) speak of manipulable and non-manipulable variables affecting women’s career paths. Educational background and longevity in a position, as discussed previously, are examples of manipulable factors Paul et. al. cite. Sibling order and a mother’s education, which have also been found to influence a female’s career mobility, are described as non-manipulable variables. Ironside (1983) states that longer work histories give women “confidence, competence and competitive professional attitudes” (p. 8) similar to those which their male colleagues are presumed to possess, thus making these women more competitive for positions. Ironside also emphasizes the value of adaptability and a wide range of qualities and skills. Moore (1984) offers the reminder that administrative positions evolve, which can affect the career decisions made. She also states that colleges and universities “play a controlling, structuring role in the definition, duration and outcome of administrative careers” (p. 14). Barrax (1985) conducted a small qualitative study of North Carolina higher education administrators, and found that many women considered their interpersonal and communications skills as crucial to their career mobility. Konrad and Pfeffer (1991) found that “... the segregation of the past is one of the most pervasive influences on the hiring patterns of the present” (p. 152). More specifically, they state, “Positions that previously had a female incumbent
are most likely to be filled subsequently by women ..., regardless of the demographic composition of the internal and external labor forces” (p. 153). Twale (1992) also found that candidates are generally selected from similarly affiliated institutions (public to public and private to private).

One might presume that a path can be planned out before it is followed, and given that the apparent requisites for a successful career in higher education administration - terminal degree, faculty experience, ascendency into chair/dean/provost/vice president/president positions - are fairly obvious, one might presume women have developed appropriate career strategies. However, the research reports that while a career is important to many women, their focus on its evolution is lacking. Hill and Ragland (1995) declare:

Because, historically, women often exercised little control over their career paths, they did little planning and goal setting. Pregnancy or a spouse’s job transfer could eliminate any career path, so it became less painful to not plan ... Female internal locus of control is a new concept (p. 76).

Kreps (1974) stated, “The inability of women to pursue careers as systematically as men because of uncertainties and interruptions leads them to settle for much less career preparation than men” (p. 81). Murrell & Donohue (1982), Ironside (1983) and Evans (1985) conducted small qualitative studies of women administrators; Murrell & Donohue focused on senior-level administrators in four-year, coeducational, state-supported institutions; Ironside’s sample included upper-level female administrators in North
Carolina four-year institutions; Evans selected women administrators in higher education in Indiana. Murrell & Donohue state, “Few women appear to formulate career plans for advancement into senior-level administrative positions” (p. 147). Ironside found that the women administrators she interviewed did participate in a form of career strategizing, albeit perhaps a different strategizing than men might conduct:

Whether they were aware of it or not, all of the subjects had found ways to further their own goals and enhance their career. Thus, they prepared themselves appropriately, they created their own support systems, they learned how to position themselves for opportunity, and how to interpret and connect their experiences, even when non-academic, with future possibilities. In other words, they became expert at career strategies which they used to bridge the gap between their own initiatives and motivations, and the initiatives and opportunities made available to them by others...

What is suggested is that these high-level careers were more the outcome of personal goals then they were of career planning and precise patterns of preparation (p. 7).

Evans (1985) found, on the other hand, that her subjects did not exhibit the same degree of planning. While career played a very important role in the lives of the women interviewed, “The decision to enter higher education administration was generally not well thought out” (p. 7). Evans notes:

Few women actively made decisions to enter higher education administration; many were offered positions or entered the field because
they could think of no other alternatives. They had no clear career dream and only general goals for career advancement. Perhaps the failure of women to achieve top level positions is partially attributable to this lack of planning (p. 17).

Among the subjects interviewed by Evans (1985), she found only one who had specific plans for her future. Pfiffner’s (1975) study of California public community colleges generated this finding: “Women are motivated to achieve their positions in administration by having someone, usually an administrator, suggest it. They then achieve their goal the year following their decision to do so” (p. 9). Freeman’s (1977) study of 20 women administrators in Washington D.C. finds that only four of these women had chosen administration as their career at an early stage. These women went right into an administrative position when they graduated from college. Cook (1997) declares,

A few women plot their administrative career paths intentionally. More of us, however, landed in our present position by a series of accidents...In a typical scenario, a women found herself ‘in the right place at the right time’ because of her husband’s job (p. 8).

Touchton, Shavlik & Davis’ (1993) comprehensive study on women in presidencies finds that only four percent of the women had “always had a goal” of being a college president, and for half of these women, this goal evolved as they climbed their career ladders (p. 19). Only 18 percent had applied directly for their presidency positions, as opposed to being nominated for, or contacted about, the position.
Fennema and Ayer (1984) declared women to be likely to be “stuck in position because of an unclear path combined with the now existing low ceilings for advancement” (p. 228). Evans summarized simply, “How the woman views her career at various points in her life is a good deal more predictable than what she will actually be doing at any particular point” (p. 15).

The women’s movement, an increase in college-educated women ready to enter the workforce, more role models and affirmative action all combined to change the way a female looked at a career, and Ironside (1983) theorized from her study:

It would appear that because these subjects were part of an era when women were less able to think in career terms, they turned their energies instead to the development of personal competencies shaped not by vocational requirements but by their own visions of success... Today, however, vast changes in society have made the case quite different. Because professional careers are a reality for many more women, there is a tendency toward an earlier focus on career goals and more deliberate career planning (p. 15).

LeBlanc (1993) takes a more contemporary stance on the matter, and admonishes:

It is becoming increasingly more important that women who aspire to advance into positions of leadership in higher education should actively plan and develop multi-dimensional career paths. Critical career pathing should identify both long-and short-range plans which address the needs of the total individual, not solely her job-related efforts (p. 48).
Reeves (1975) reports findings of her 1973-74 analysis of job satisfaction of women administrators in higher education, and says "It is interesting to note that 63% of the sample are not working in their original career choice. Approximately 5% are employed at a lower level than the original goal; the remaining 32% have achieved to a far greater extent than they initially hoped" (p. 134). Yet the 1994 Hubbard and Robinson study of over 100 female administrators reports that the majority of the females (52 percent) desire to stay at their current level.

Role Model Influences

The significance of role models in the career development of female administrators does not get addressed in much of the literature on women in higher education administration. Mentorship and sponsorship appears to be more frequently assessed. (Merriam, Thomas & Zeph write in 1987 that "several hundred articles on mentoring" have been published since 1978, although they found only 26 to be empirically based research reports dealing with higher education, p. 200.) Jones (1988) offers qualifying definitions of mentors and sponsors:

Mentors are leaders who teach necessary skills and provide important information. Their help is present-oriented and they are usually found at the middle management level of the organization. Sponsors teach less but have a greater impact on career advancement by encouraging staff development for women, by assigning high-visibility projects, and by making recommendations for promotion. They are future-oriented and are usually found in upper management where they can influence organizational decision making (p. 5).
Matcynski and Comer (1991) offer a more enhanced definition of mentoring:

Mentoring at its best is an extension in commitment beyond the usual supportive and administrative functions of the leader. It is a type of learning relationship that focuses as much upon the personal as on the professional development of both individuals as it does on the protégé acquiring specific skills. There is also much to be learned, acquired and developed by the mentor as teacher, guide, counselor, and communicator... The mentoring relationship requires an environment in which to develop (p. 18).

Of course, a connection can be made between role modeling and mentoring/sponsoring, for one who sponsors or mentors another may very well be a role model as well to that individual. Perhaps the sparsity of female role models contributes to the limited research. Gappa and Uehling (1979) adhere to the “faculty to administrator” career path as they state:

Since women constitute a relatively small proportion of faculty on most campuses, positive role models are likely to be in short supply for women students. The situation is exacerbated by the fact that women faculty frequently are lodged in lower ranks without tenure and earn less than their male colleagues in every rank; therefore, whether they are viewed as successful role models in an academic career by woman students is questionable. Some women, however, rise above these disadvantages to project a superwoman image (p. 33).

Weaver (1978) points out one significant exception to the general scarcity of role
models: women's colleges. She notes that at these institutions the faculty include a higher representation of women; on average, 45 percent. The average is approximately 20 percent at coeducational institutions. Students at women colleges, therefore, have "a wide range of and substantial number of women role models" (p. 8), which sends the message that high achievement really is possible for women.

In speaking to the scarcity of female role models, researchers also often support the assertion that role models can be critical to a female administrator's career development. Carlson and Schmuck (1981) contend:

Given the sparsity for women of what have come to be called role models or same-sex functionaries in the occupation, a woman aspirant's opportunities to study and compare their talents, skills, and abilities with her own is very limited. Without such opportunities one cannot be on secure footing about the appropriateness of the choice of an occupation. The imbalance of male and female role models is a further disadvantage for women in meeting the contingencies related to positions of policymaking and management in education. The scarcity of women role models affects the contingencies of counsel, encouragement, and socialization, at least to the extent that women choose women as sources for these things (p. 121).

Bower (1993) applies a general statement specifically to women in higher education, "The absence of some role models has an inhibiting effect on the career advancement of
women” (p. 93). Johnsrud and Rosser (1999) conclude that women who work with very few other women have lower workplace morale. Paul, Sweet and Brigham (1980) state, “Since there are very few females in top-level administrative positions, there are very few role models for aspiring administrators to emulate” (p. 159) They point to the historical likelihood, “Since female role models and an ‘old gal system’ were not in place, the females probably were less likely to understand the informal norms” (p. 161), such as equating a higher-level credential (the doctorate) with higher-level administrative positions. Nieboer (1975) states:

\[ ... \] perhaps because of the scarcity of role models of successful women administrators or the stereotype of the ‘career woman’ which still exists, most women are not ready to contemplate non-traditional high-level administrative positions (those other than Dean of Women, Nursing, or Home Economics) in coeducational institutions. These two problems are clearly interrelated: without role models, an increase in women administrative applicants seems unlikely; without an increase in applications and appointments, the number of women administrators is not likely to increase (p. 99).

Williams and Piper (1988) interviewed 18 women top-level administrators at public four-year higher education institutions regarding career advancement and role models. Their findings vary:

One respondent stated that the lack of a female role model at her present institution presents a problem to her now that she is dean. She perceives it as a hindrance not to be able to discuss with a female how to do things as a female.
Another Dean said that the role models at her institution were excellent; one role model, in particular, thought a major task was to groom the respondent. A vice president stated that the lack of role models as a constraint really holds true; most high school teachers are women whereas in higher education, most faculty members are men. Another vice president declared that she had no female role models, but had terrific male role models. Therefore, she did not perceive that there had been a shortage of role models for her (p. 35).

The literature that more specifically addresses mentoring and sponsoring also alludes to the sparsity of these influencers for women administrators. Epstein (1970) conjectures, “It is probably true that informal sex quotas are maintained for fellowships and scholarships. It is also probably true that senior professors do groom young women as disciples or successors, though they utilize their skills as assistants” (p. 66). Grooming is also addressed by Stringer (1977):

Academic women simply have not been groomed for management positions as have rising young men. They have not been given clues about how and when to advance, have not been encouraged to advance, have rarely been protégées of those influential in administration (p. 23).

Fennema and Ayer (1984) conclude, “Women cannot assume mentorships at the next highest levels, but men can... Male bonding is assumed and will come about, but women have to exert more effort to attract even the most elementary forms of recognition” (p. 237). In assessing the structure of promotion opportunity in the university, Sagaria and Johnsrud (1992) speculate that the practice of sponsorship may be linked to the practice
of filling new positions, "...with obvious implications for women and minorities. Because they are less likely sponsors or sponsorees than white men, they are also less likely to be selected for new positions" (p. 198). Bower (1993) presented the "Queen Bee" phenomena as another reason for scarcity of female mentors. This theory presumes that there is room for only one outstanding woman in an organization, and therefore other women are expected to fight their way to the top, as the current "Queen Bee" did.

Aery (1977) speaks further to the "Queen Bee Syndrome":

The Queen Bee is the woman who has "fought her way up in a man's world" and, in her own self-interest, opposes other women succeeding. The implicit reasons for this kind of behavior may range from not wanting to "rock the boat," to wishing to exclude competition, or to desiring the rewards usually given by the system for being that unique kind of woman who "thinks like a man"...The "Queen Bee" disassociates herself from the fundamental issues of equality for women, while assuring her male colleagues that she is not in sympathy with the feminist movement. Younger women very often view the successful woman administrator as a deliberative, manipulative risk-taker and thus do not choose to identify with her as a role model (pp. 43-44).

Based on interviews of women administrators in higher education, Evans (1985) concluded: "Women enter higher education administration based on the advice of people in the field, look to colleagues for support, and frequently attribute their success to supervisors or mentors who guided them along the way" (p. 16). Other studies conducted have produced similar findings. Barrax (1985), reporting the results of her study on
female and male administrators, found that more than 75 percent of both the men and women respondents had mentors or role models in their educational and professional experience. Warner and DeFleur (1993) found from their study of nearly 400 male and female administrators that "having a sponsor is significantly related to current positions only for women. Women fare better when they are sponsored, but this is not the case for men" (p. 17). Hubbard & Robinson (1994) studied over 100 women administrators and report that the majority had mentors at the master's and doctoral levels, as well as in their early professional academic careers. Regarding the latter, the majority of the mentors were female, but a higher percentage of females had male mentors during their master's and doctoral programs. McNeer's study (1983) examined the role of mentor and the mentoring relationship in the career development of female administrators in higher education. She conducted interviews of nine women and found:

Eight of the nine women in this study could readily name a significant person who had contributed to their career development. Two categorized these "others" as role models or guides rather than as mentors. Six could identify at least one mentor who had had a significant influence upon their careers... All six could also identify persons who influenced their move into administration. Four of the six would not have sought such positions without the encouragement provided by this mentor. Two women who knew they wanted to seek administrative appointments identified and sought support from a sponsor who provided assistance in the move from the faculty ranks to administration (p. 73).

McNeer (1983) further qualified how the mentors aided these women, "The
women identified a number of ways in which both their primary and secondary mentors assisted them. Included were encouragement/recognition, instruction/training, friendship, opportunities/responsibilities, advice/counsel, inspiration/role modeling, and visibility” (p. 74). Freeman (1977) looks at the profile of 27 women in top-level administrative positions in Washington, D.C., and in capsuling the characteristics common to such administrators, states, “Even though the woman administrator had some difficulty identifying a woman model who inspired her interest to become an administrator, she indicated a primary motivation came from suggestions made by others – usually males she knew as her superiors” (p. 7). Moore, Twombly & Martorana’s (1985) national study of administrators in community and junior colleges reports that 54.1 percent of the female administrators had at least one mentor, compared with 49.4 percent of the males:

As for whether the mentor assisted the respondent in obtaining the current position, female administrators (46.7 percent) are more likely than males (37.7 percent) to report that they had.

Women (18.0 percent) were slightly more likely than men (17.4 percent) to have become a candidate through appointment by a senior administrator or through recommendation by a mentor (11.1 percent and 6.6 percent, respectively) (p. 91).

Testimony to the impact of mentoring can be found in a 1994 interview of Dr. Linda Wilson, college president (as reported in Arnold, 1994):

I had a very good high school chemistry teacher who I’m sure is part of what even made it seem possible for me to go into chemistry; and then four wonderful
women chemistry teachers in my undergraduate school who illustrated that you can be a woman chemist, a wonderful human being, and a splendid teacher. One of them was married and had a family, so the role model was full in that sense.

In graduate school my major professor was a very good mentor. He was a feminist even then and was a superb graduate advisor in terms of encouraging you to be independent but also being encouraging, approachable, friendly, and working towards your being a peer.

So I had chosen mentors, sometimes without people even realizing that I saw them in this way. I have found that to be a wonderful way to learn (p. 99).

Others report the critical nature of mentorship or sponsorship for women in high education administration. Warner and DeFleur (1993) summarized:

Because higher education administration is still a relatively small field with many strong networks, mentoring and sponsorship play a particularly important role in the advancement of women. Mentors help proteges understand the rules of the game; they give positive support for accomplishments and provide feedback on performance. Mentoring relationships also should include sponsorship so that the careers of proteges can be more carefully directed (p. 7).

Oakes (1999) states, “Women who participate in professional mentorships are likely to feel supported and encouraged in the face of obstacles such as requests for salary raises, leadership crises, and personal household responsibilities” (p. 61). Follon (1983) gives testimony to the value of female mentors for women administrators; her study of senior
level higher education administrators in Iowa reveals that female teachers were the most influential people in their career development, and they also report that career mentors are extremely helpful to young women who look forward to academic administration careers. Bower (1993) declares mentoring for women as "a requirement rather than a nicety" in a man's world. "For women in academic administration in higher education, mentoring is a very important way to 'make it' in a world not necessarily familiar or accommodating" (p. 91). She adds:

Over the last 20 years the advice has been much more realistic but the problem of "making it" in a male dominant career is still a matter of finding a fit without discarding self. Having a woman mentor who has been able to master this conflict is an important aspect of a women's success in a career predominantly male filled (p. 95).

Hill and Ragland (1995) declare mentoring to be especially important for women "because this has not been a long-standing part of career development for women" (p. 76). As a result of her study, McNeer (1983) concluded:

Although mentoring will not open the way to an administrative career for a woman who lacks appropriate skills and background, there are women on each academic campus with the skills and abilities for leadership. One critical factor in the development of this administrative potential is the challenge and support of a mentor (p. 75).

Sponsorship, Sagaria and Johnsrud (1992) found, has advantages for the sponsoree, including career coaching "and access to positions or decision makers that
might not otherwise be available". (p. 197). Others refer to networking in their study of career advancement for women administrators; Twale (1995) points to competition for top leadership roles and suggests, “Networking with colleagues at conferences and regional meetings could therefore have a positive effect on women’s upward career mobility and professional development” (no pagination). LeBlanc (1993) states:

Networking is a key method for establishing a personal system of support... By establishing and maintaining a strong internal/external support system, a woman becomes more resourceful. The greater her resourcefulness, then the greater her sphere of possible positive influence in higher education (p. 48).

Ausejo (1993) also speaks to networking:

Networking is an informal support system that can be used by women administrators in the development of a career plan. Men have had this system in place for a long time and recognize the importance of this camaraderie tool. Enterprising “career-minded” women will also take advantage of the opportunity to benefit from networking. Recognizing that diversification can lend itself to an enriching balance in her mission to succeed, she will network with both men and women (p. 84).

Hubbard & Robinson (1994) find that nearly 50 percent of the women administrators they studied stated that networking “helped them to obtain the position they currently held in administration”; and over 96 percent “believe that networking is helpful to individuals and new professionals in reaching career
goals" (p. 15).

However, Merriam, Thomas & Zeph (1987) carefully review 26 empirically based research reports on mentoring in higher education, and they present conflicting reports on the value of mentoring. In particular, they cite: Sagaria (1982), who “surveyed 180 women administrators in Pennsylvania and found that fewer than half felt that a mentor was important in their career;” Ironside (1982), who conducted structured interviews with 30 women from North Carolina institutions, and reports that other variables can be more important than mentoring, “including uninterrupted careers, the ability to use background and previous experiences, and, most important, the ability to form a vision of success;” and Mann (1980), who “found that few of the 245 women surveyed had had mentors in the classical sense of a nurturer, supporter, teacher and guide” (pp. 204-205).

The role of family as influencers for women administrators is also examined in some of the literature. Husbands in particular receive attention. Atteberry (1985) reports findings from her study, in which 17 percent of the female administrator respondents indicated that their husbands were the primary influencers in their career development. The recognition of their spouses as actual mentors, however, did not take place early in their relationships. Ten of the nineteen respondents were further interviewed, and all ten felt their spouses were “exceptionally supportive” of their career development. Several indicated that their husbands were willing to sacrifice their own career goals to support their
wives. Evans (1985) also reports from her interviews of female administrators that all the married women describe their husbands as supportive of their careers, although she qualifies this support further, "The husbands seem to be supportive of their wives' careers as long as the women are making the compromises and they, themselves, are not called upon to alter their career plans" (p. 18).

The mothers of women administrators are also examined in the literature. Epstein (1970) suggests that professional mothers are positive role models for their daughters, because they support the notion that it is possible to pursue both a career and motherhood, as well as enjoy this work. The expansive study that Twombly and Moore (1991) undertook to assess the social origins of higher education administrators reports findings which seem to support Epstein's contention. The women respondents consistently came from families "in which mothers were more likely than their male counterparts' mothers to be employed outside of the home" (p. 502). They also found that many of these mothers had pursued a level of higher education. Twombly and Moore summarize, "Women who become administrators are more likely to come from highly educated, two career families. These findings provide further support for previously stated conclusions that women benefit from family role-models" (p. 503). Touchton, Shavlik and Davis (1993) examined women in presidencies in 1985, and found that 44 percent of all mothers of women presidents "had worked outside the home at some time when their daughters were in elementary or high school... The mothers of these presidents seem to have served as early role models for career pursuit and achievement" (p. 40).

Pfiffner (1975) studied female administrators at 92 California public community colleges,
and found that the top-level administrators came from homes where both parents, especially the mother, stress the importance of education. Freeman (1977) reports on the profile of top-level women administrators in Washington D.C., and notes also that the typical women administrator was encouraged by her parents, and achieved more formal education than either parent.

The literature has presented the scarcity of female role models for female higher education administrators, and at the same time confirmed that mentorship/sponsorship can be vital to a woman’s career development. One can deduce then that male role models/mentors/sponsors must have been present for some female administrators during their career development. Barrax (1985) reports from her study that the majority of mentors discussed by respondents were male; McNeer (1983) reports that the female administrators in her study were not concerned with the gender of their mentors.

However, the literature also points to reasons why some men refuse to mentor women administrators, adding to the problem of lack of sponsorship for women. Bower (1993) in particular points to two reasons. She explains that the potential sexual aspects of a male-female relationship can cause a male to avoid mentorship, for fear his motives will be misunderstood by others. Also potentially restrictive is the male perception that the career motives of women are not to be taken seriously. Matcynski & Comer (1991) report on a reversal of this refusal to mentor women, which is the female proteges’ refusal to engage in after-work meetings or late work sessions with their male mentors, fearing office gossip and perceived sexual favors.
Role of Socialization

The role of socialization in women’s higher education administration career paths is examined in the literature on women in higher education administration. But it is also the topic of research regarding other career paths of females. Indeed, the effect of societal mores and expectations may impact any career path a female chooses (or chooses not) to pursue; sex role stereotyping, for instance, may share similarities in its outcomes for women attempting to ascend the business managerial ladder with its outcomes for women seeking to reach high level administrative positions in the nation’s colleges and universities. For the purposes of this paper’s research, the topic of socialization was only examined in the literature which addressed it in the context of higher education administration.

Bower (1993) makes an interesting observation regarding women’s career choices (citing Bolton, 1980 within this observation):

There are many factors that influence women’s career decisions. Social images and American values are often contradictory in terms of women and work. Ambivalence and ambiguity about career choices and measures of success tend to be present more often with women than men. In a search for answers as to why women remain at lower or mid-level jobs, sex role stereotyping is the reason most often proposed. While stereotyping certainly contributes to women’s lack of progress upward, stereotypical attitudes neither individually nor collectively account for differences in career development (p. 92).
Bower suggests that a woman's role conflict with career and family, her potential lack of career motivation and competitiveness, and her encounters with sexism in her career development are all elements impacting her career growth. These elements are factors of socialization, and they are consistently cited in the literature.

The lack of strategic career planning by female administrators was examined earlier in this chapter. This potential career weakness can be largely attributed to societal influencers. Minimal aspirations, fear of success, lack of adequate preparation and low self-confidence levels have all contributed to the self-imposed career limitations - including limited career planning - which visit many females in higher education administration.

Fennema and Ayer (1984) state, "...careers are a legitimate masculine pursuit as defined by society, a definition which has had a devastating effect upon the psyche of women" (p. 236). In its devotion to family, American society configured long ago the expected adult roles of females: wife and mother. As the women's movement, questions of equal rights and the economy all combined to complicate this notion, women found themselves with the freedom, even the encouragement, and often the necessity to earn college degrees and join the professional workforce. Yet society still presented expectations of marriage and motherhood to women - and if society did not exert enough pressure in this regard, the laws of nature often did. Males were not presented with a similar dilemma, at least not until very recently. The female college graduate did not often see an example of a female professional who also chose marriage and children with little apparent sacrifice, and so career choices were often impacted.
Epstein (1970) observes, "The socialization of the typical American woman affects the motivation even of the college educated woman and usually undercuts her career potential" (p. 51). She conjectures, "Anticipation of problems and expectations of ultimate defeat probably do result in weak commitment to any career goal, lessened investment in training, and perhaps less toleration of early deprivations which would make success more possible." Epstein suggests that many career limitations on women are self imposed, and emphasizes:

It is important to stress that although there are factors of reality which deflect women from choosing careers, the socialization process works on the woman in such a way that she often decides against a career without actually testing reality. Rather, she anticipates consequences and accepts limitations or a defeat which may not be inevitable in her case (p. 69).

Freeman's (1977) study suggests there are "strong forces" preventing women from achieving careers. "These forces are found not merely in the world of work, but are also embedded in women's own conceptions" (p. 18). In Williams' and Piper's study (1988), eight of their eighteen respondents mentioned "develop self-confidence as a skill to overcome the constraints related to self-imposed factors or behaviors" (p. 40). One of the ways women can "decide against a career" is to avoid earning the necessary credentials to be competitive for positions. As examined earlier in this chapter, the appropriate educational preparation for a career in higher education administration is crucial. Flynn (1993) states, "Historically there has been a lack of awareness among women that leadership roles were potential avenues for them. Therefore they did not
prepare themselves or show tremendous interest in getting administrative positions” (p. 118). Epstein (1970) found that most women students at a “high-prestige” college did not intend to pursue professional and graduate education; “They have no future image of themselves as working women” (p. 65). This was largely attributed to expectations of their future spouses needing to come first as far as careers were concerned. Murrell & Donohue (1982) state the finding from their study that “Married women appear to place more emphasis upon the career advancement of husbands than upon their own careers until the women are in their late 40’s and 50’s” (p. 148). Flynn (1993) draws this conclusion:

It is not uncommon to see women come back to school to begin or complete their education after raising a family or holding a job to support their spouse’s educational aspirations. When this occurs they generally set professional expectations in terms of qualifications and abilities lower because other kinds of demands have been put on their time (p. 120).

Spouses, marriage and children certainly impact the career development of women administrators. Epstein (1970) declares, “It is not easy to isolate all the contradictory messages intelligent young women get from their environment about expectations for their future. The primary message, of course, is that in order to be ‘women,’ they must seek marriage” (p. 62). Evans (1985) found from her study:

Marital and family roles are especially important in career development.

Never married women were more likely to exhibit continuous work patterns and to center their lives around their careers. Married women,
especially those with children, experience more role strain, find their
careers influenced by career decisions their husbands make, and seem to
have more varied work histories than single women. Their careers are
important to them but so are their family roles (p. 15).

As was highlighted previously in this chapter, continuous work patterns ("time in
line" patterns) are very important in the career development of higher education
administrators. Dublon (1983) found in her study of women higher education
administration doctoral students that most of her respondents were planning on
marriage and family. However, they expected these events to take place after age
thirty. She also found:

Respondents who were married or who planned to be married cited a supportive
husband as the reason marriage would enhance or have no effect on their
advancement... Those women who planned on remaining single also viewed their
marital status as either enhancing or having no effect on career advancement
because of the perceived flexibility which would accompany their status... Less
flexibility was seen as a limitation attributed to raising a family. Women who did
not expect to have children indicated that their advancement would either be
enhanced or would not be affected because of the greater flexibility achieved
without children (p. 46).

Mark (1986) makes the connection between career aspirations and societal expectations.
She states:

Professional women's socialization to work generally begins with parental
expectations that although work and careers are important and highly regarded, they will always be secondary to marriage, husband and children. These expectations are reinforced by those of peers, school counselors, church, and the media, with the result that females’ career aspirations are lower than males, while their lack of self-confidence is greater (p. 3).

Freeman (1977) states that women have the same drives as men for power, authority and status, but they have been socialized differently and must take a “circuitous route” to attaining these goals “because society has taught them that certain aggressive behaviors are not ladylike” (p. 17). Flynn (1993) speaks also to how a woman is “raised” and how her career therefore develops, “Women are no different from men in needing to prepare themselves and recognize opportunities when they occur. They are different from men in that they aren’t raised to view positions of leadership as possible professional goals” (p. 119). LeBlanc (1993) also discusses the impact of a female’s upbringing as it pertains to organizational “fit”:

Many women, particularly minorities and women from lower socio-economic groups, experience difficulty with organizational “fit” both with their internal and experiential work environments. This difficulty may result from a lack of exposure to and interaction with varied social groups and economic levels. The greater the personal exposure, then the greater the opportunities to understand and communicate with larger and more diverse populations in higher education (p. 45).
Bower (1993) points to childhood experiences for girls, and in particular their lack of sports participation. Because girls do not participate in team sports as much as boys do, she says, they grow up to be women who are less likely to develop the skills necessary for the mentoring relationship that can be vital to their career development. Williams and Piper's study (1988) of 18 women administrators at Upper Midwest public colleges and universities offers a slightly different twist to the sports connection: “Although they perceived that lack of previous opportunities to participate in team sports had not been a significant constraint, nine respondents did state that learning to be competitive was important” (p. 33).

Mentorship, also examined previously in this chapter as a significant factor in a female administrator's career, is discussed further by Bower (1993):

Another factor that has contributed to keeping women at lower level jobs is the long-term socialization process that influences role development. A part of this process is the monitoring relationship whereby an experienced person provides guidance and support to the developing novice. Women have had limited access to this kind of relationship and consequently suffer a significant disadvantage in competing with their male counterparts for promotion and advancement (p. 92).

Bower states that often men do not consider women to be serious about their careers, largely because women have “society’s full approval” to leave their profession at any level. Men therefore are inclined not to mentor women. Flynn (1993) also reflects on the difficulty many men have in mentoring women, and points to past socialization, “Often
men view women as mothers, wives, or daughters, and women have been trained to see
themselves in these supporting roles” (p. 115).

While Bower (1993) cites Bolton’s view (1980) that stereotyping does not
individually or collectively account for differences in career development, she does
concede that stereotyping can inhibit a women’s career development. Kaplan and Helly
(1984) also wrote on this topic, and state that socialization causes men and women to
have “differences in their perceptions of the world” (p. 68). Women carry an extra
burden, they suggest:

Even as women begin to be leaders of colleges and universities in greater
numbers, they bring to these roles sensitivity to their differences with male
colleagues in predominantly male academic communities. The desire to fit
in, to be seen not as a token but as part of the system, balances the
awareness that, whatever they do, they will be seen as representatives of
their kind (p. 68).

Gappa and Uehling (1979) look at the steps women in academe must take to reach greater
equality, and use Broverman’s study of sex-role stereotypes as context. Qualities viewed
as masculine or feminine, according to societal groups, include: men - aggressive,
independent, dominant, logical; women - passive, dependent, subjective, emotional,
noncompetitive, indecisive. “Such stereotyping greatly affects women’s self-esteem and
achievement motivation as well as men’s attitudes regarding women’s potential and
roles” (p. 30), the authors report. They cite women’s exclusion from “old boys’ clubs”
where informal training occurs, as one of the outcomes of this stereotyping.
A minority opinion, however, is registered by Andruskiw & Howes (1980) who studied the attitudes of female and male administrators toward sex-role images, examining the relationship between those attitudes and the evaluation by these administrators of other men and women as administrators. Andruskiw & Howes report "that sex does not appear to be a significant factor in the evaluation of an administrator's performance" (p. 485). They dispute, therefore, the theory of discrimination against women administrators as related solely to negative attitudes and evaluations.

Fennema and Ayer (1984) reflect upon the change slowly happening regarding gender-role stereotypes:

The need to achieve by men is ascribed to their role as provider and is viewed as an inappropriate need for women. The female stereotype is just beginning to change, allowing women similar assertive needs and role identifications. We are slowly accepting the fact that problem-solving skills and management techniques are not peculiar to the male species, but are instead learned behaviors. Similarly, we are only recently allowing men the freedom to choose domestic and service roles previously thought to be suitable only for women (p. 237).

Yet Flynn (1993) contends:

Some of the institutions that have the opportunity to recruit women as presidents have a great fear that if they do, the institution will not be taken seriously... Reasons cited for removing qualified women from the applicant pool included a belief that women cannot effectively fund raise,
will not be taken seriously by the higher education community, and cannot administer large institutions or competitive sports programs. Vestiges of sexism still exist on the part of boards of trustees and regents who make decisions about hiring. There is still the belief that women can’t raise money and certainly can’t administrate over a major football or basketball team (p. 114).

Authors above suggest that stereotypical attitudes can impact a female administrator’s career development when a superior or related decision-maker exercises his/her stereotyping. But stereotypes may also contribute to the self-limiting a woman can exercise in her own career journey. The respondents of Benton’s (1980) study felt “the perpetuation of gender-role stereotyping in the American society has resulted in many women not viewing themselves as potential administrators” (p. 7). Horner and Walsh (1974) describe another consequence of stereotyping:

Evidence indicates that women who seek independence and intellectual mastery pay a high personal price for their defiance of prescribed sex roles, a price in anxiety. This idea is encompassed in the conceptualization of the Motive to Avoid Success. Horner has argued that most women have a motive to avoid success - that is, a disposition to become anxious about achieving success - because they expect negative consequences such as social rejection and/or feelings of being unfeminine as a result of succeeding (p. 139).

Fennema and Ayer (1984) suggest a different socialization outcome. They state instead
that women can become “street-wise in academia” and are called “devious, manipulative, and intuitive” (p. 234). These women have learned “how to organize and control their environment in order to achieve their goals and satisfy needs, acting to provide for themselves in ways they themselves do not even recognize” (p. 234).

Barriers to Career Growth

Throughout the literature on career paths of women in higher education administration, a variety of barriers are uncovered that impact the career development of female administrators. Many of these barriers appear in previous sections of this chapter, such as low self-esteem, time-in-line experience, societal demands, lack of sponsorship and discrimination. Indeed, barriers were cited and connected with the research done on all subsidiary questions addressed in this chapter regarding common career paths, role models and socialization.

Mark (1986) reported her findings and those of a variety of other researchers regarding administrator career issues:

Internal factors limiting women’s activity in administrative positions also operate and include reduced leadership aspirations, unwillingness to accept increased responsibilities due to family commitments, and deliberate curtailment of professional achievement due to family demands. Major external problems faced by administrative women include a lack of qualitative opportunities, absence of or a limited informal support network through which job openings and information could be shared, and outright sex discrimination in hiring (p. 12).
sex discrimination in hiring (p. 12).
Her summary touches upon most of the barriers which are cited throughout the literature on women in higher education administration.

Marriage status and child rearing are factors frequently associated with limitations in a woman administrator’s career development. The role of wife may conflict with role of administrator where career mobility is concerned (having to decide which spouse’s job warrants moving or staying put), while being a female administrator of some authority may fly in the face of social conventions (the traditional husband and wife team presumes the husband is the chief administrator and the wife is the social hostess). Childbearing and child rearing can necessitate a “time out” from a career, typically taken by the mother. A female administrator then disrupts her time-in-line cycle for her career, and appears a less competitive candidate when reentering the workforce with male higher education administrators. Warner and DeFleur (1993) summarize:

Women are often disadvantaged in the labor market primarily because they are less likely than men to hold the valued resource of continuous employment records. Because women take time out of the labor market (whether by choice or cultural mandate) they receive less on-the-job training and their previously accumulated skills depreciate in value as they become rusty with use (p. 4).

Hill and Ragland (1995) concur:

Because women’s careers are interrupted, secondly important, and/or started later in life, women lack a sense of how people receive advancements in their organizations. They are conditioned to think that hard work, good performance, and adding to their competence will necessarily allow them to advance (p. 76).
and adding to their competence will necessitate...
Many other researchers point to these barriers in their findings. Kreps (1974) declares, “In particular, married women face greater problems than men in job mobility and family responsibilities...; women’s restricted freedom of job choice now inevitably prevents them from attaining the ranks and salaries reached by men of comparable competence” (p. 82). Warner, et al. (1988) conjecture, “In placing family ahead of career early on, women may not be able to achieve the highest level positions to the same extent as men” (p. 10). They also found that women were selecting lifestyles without husbands or children in an effort to overcome the barriers to career development which marriage and family can bring. Dublon (1983) reports findings from her study of higher education administration doctoral students, including the perception that raising a family meant less flexibility in career advancement. Graham (1974) focuses on the common career path of faculty member to administrator, and notes that a young female assistant professor generally finds it difficult to get published at the same time she may very well be bearing children. Clarke (1988) reports from her study centering on Duke University administrators, both male and female:

Most of the interviewees felt that while those doing the hiring and promoting may have overcome a prejudice that women are less competent than men, they are still making decisions on the basis of the issues of childbearing and childrearing. Women at all levels stated a key ingredient of their effectiveness in their jobs was keeping parenting under control, keeping it from interfering with their work — no matter how hard that might be. Women with families and careers may know best that what prevents them from pushing as hard as they can to seek the next level of
that what prevents them from pushing on
responsibility, or to get the training necessary to advance, is fear of exhaustion.

Indeed, that is what Duke women said: where they felt the need to apologize for not having gone as far as they themselves would like, it was by conscious choice to put their families first (p. 50).

By taking time out to bear and raise children, women add gaps to their professional career which men rarely show. As Warner, et al. (1988) state, “Longer careers in administration and the gaining of additional experiences that come with time may be one area that separates the development of administrative careers for men from those of women” (p. 6). Men also rarely face another family-related barrier which women must often confront: limitations in geographical mobility. As cited previously on the issue of socialization and its impact, women often put their spouse’s careers before their own. Thus, they may be unable to accept career advancement opportunities which include a move geographically. As Kaplan and Helly (1984) state, “Senior administrators are peripatetic. They must be prepared to move themselves and their families to a new location if they wish to advance professionally. For married women, this need for mobility can have negative effects on husband and family” (p. 69). In Dublon’s (1983) study of female higher education administration doctoral students, geographical mobility was the limitation cited more frequently.

Historically, anti nepotism rules have proven to be an obstacle as well for females to move forward in their administrative careers. Moore (1984) points to policies as having an impact on the distribution of women in higher education administration, citing anti nepotism rules as having often “prevented spouses, who were usually female, from
working on the same campus as their partners” (p. 13). Rossi and Calderwood (1973) find anti nepotism rules to be ‘highly discriminatory to qualified women married to male faculty and administrators.’ Kreps (1974) urges that the removal of nepotism rules should take place to “allow wives and husbands to hold posts in the same institution (or the same department)” (p. 82).

As covered in the previous section regarding the sociological impact on women’s career development in higher education administration, the female administrator herself can serve as a barrier to career advancement. In the interviews that Evans (1985) conducted of women in higher education administration, a number of the interviewees cited their lack of clear goals as an inhibiting factor in their career development. Carlson and Schmuck (1981) conclude:

In education women may perceive of themselves as competent with regard to instructional matters, yet with regard to the male sex-typed role of administration believe themselves to be inferior. It is clear that perceived competence has clearly been a negative factor in the past for women educators with regard to the personal contingency involved in careers in administration (p. 122).

Sturnick, Milley and Tisinger (1991) look closely at female presidential tenures at state colleges and universities, and observe that women are less inclined to “rack up consecutive presidencies” (p. 97) as do male colleagues. They attribute this to the “selfless investment” (p. 97) women presidents make in the institutions they head, as well as a tendency to make longer time commitments to current positions. This may not be
perceived as a barrier to career development by some, but it can be argued that even at a presidential level, women's less aggressive approach to career advancement can deter them from gaining more experience in other positions of presidency.

Societal expectations can also serve as barriers to career growth for such women, although once again, the female's perception of herself can certainly influence how much of a barrier these expectations become in the career. McNeer (1983) reports results from her study of women administrators' career development:

When asked about their career development and potential barriers they might have encountered, these women identified the role of women in society as a problem, but cited the effects of the woman's movement as having enhanced their advancement possibilities. One subject reported that she spent too much of her life "doing womanly things" and that her career pace was slowed because of that (p. 74).

Warner and DeFleur (1993) examine the hiring process of higher education administrators, and point to social activities and the expectations attached to them as potentially detrimental to the female's career development.

Another factor that may impact the selection of administrators is the ability to meet social expectations. Administrators represent their schools in a variety of community and professional groups and they are expected to host a large number of social events. Some people assume that these activities should be carried out with the traditional husband and wife team. This may pose problems for women administrators since only about one
half of them are currently married. In contrast, almost all (90 percent) male administrators are married and fewer than half of their wives have full-time employment, so it is possible for them to be supportive in meeting the social demands of these roles (p. 17).

The hiring process itself can present a number of barriers to women administrators as they seek career advancement. Predominately male search committees, the job market, institutionally-set constraints and acts of discrimination are such obstacles cited in the literature. Selection process across all fields has certain general characteristics in common; educational administration is no exception.

The composition of search committees can significantly impact the outcome of such committees’ work. Ernst (1982) reports:

Committee and task force appointments provide new experiences within an institution, not only for women, but for people from all constituent groups. Too often such appointments perpetuate stereotype classifications. Institutions appoint English faculty (usually women) to library committees, math and management faculty (usually men) to budget committees, and engineering faculty (usually men) to facilities committees. Presidential search committees often have a built-in bias that women lack budgetary experience.

This same concern often arises when women are considered for mid-management and dean level positions. Carefully considered committee appointments can provide experience, specifically in fiscal management, that may decide whether a screening committee seriously considers a woman for any
administrative position in an institution (p. 20).

Kaplan and Helly (1984) observe:

The search committees that seek senior administrators are usually composed of senior males. Many of these men are free from overt sexism. Nevertheless, they are often more concerned about the ability of a woman candidate to fit in with the existing organization than they are about her skills, accomplishments, and vision (p. 68).

Sagaria and Johnsrud (1992) concur, “the extent to which a candidate is known influences how the structure of opportunity works for him or her….decision makers choose persons who seem like them to fill important positions” (p. 196). They conclude, “The practice of reproducing one’s self has obvious adverse consequences for women and minorities in higher education because white men hold the majority of senior administrative positions with final authority for most hiring decisions” (p. 196). Johnsrud and Heck (1994) provide more detail about this hiring practice:

Common origins and experiences tend to be used as indicators of personal similarity, and therefore, trustworthiness. Thus, there is a tendency for decision makers to choose persons like themselves when they seek to fill positions which are not easily characterized by specific skills and abilities.

Gender is often the obvious characteristic to be reproduced (p. 27).

The fact that many administrator positions may be filled through a search committee process, and that these committees “are composed primarily of senior males” (p. 6), according to Warner and DeFleur (1993), means that the committee is usually most
reinforces the ideology of...the community college – and a specific dominant class – a relatively small group of white male scholars and practitioners" (p. 132). They refer to “mainstream” authors as almost exclusively white males. The potential impact of this writing, Amey and Twombly argue, is the exclusion of individuals from leadership opportunities who don’t fit that ideology or dominant class.

Kaplan and Helly (1984) address hiring practices in university administration, and conclude that the questions and concerns search committee members often ask reflect “the desire of those in universities to be led by individuals who share the organization’s values and who can relate to the institution’s political, economic, and social realities” (p. 69). Twale (1992) observes, “College and university search committees filter and identify candidates for positions who reflect their own values systems and credentials and tend to hire from within the same system, public to public or private to private university” (p. 17). Ost and Twale (1989) report, “There is continuing evidence that hiring practices emphasize the accumulation of intuitively defined appropriate experiences - without any evidence that the candidates’ experiences were judged good or bad - to the exclusion of expressed criteria of competence.” Fennema and Ayer (1984) add:

The determinants of university decisions are accountability to various constituencies, federal and state legislation as it affects educational priorities and funding patterns, and national economic conditions. Strategy becomes judgmental and changing as educational lenders seek the best resolution for maximum growth. For women and minorities, such strategies become antithetical to equality of educational opportunity as
evidenced by little institutional interest in support programs for academic advancement. Judgemental strategy rarely works for the benefit of those who are apart from the common mold (p. 224).

Job market conditions can be a boost or a barrier for the female administrator’s career growth, according to Evans (1985):

The influence of job market conditions on the career development of women is clearly evident in the data. A much more fluid job market and lack of affirmative action requirements allowed the older women to move in and out of positions and to take positions offered without formally applying for them. This type of flexibility is not evident in the careers of younger women and may force them to plan their careers more carefully (p. 17).

Institutional conditions and constraints may also impede the woman administrator’s career development. Moore (1984) offers a reminder:

Individual administrators are not entirely free to pick and choose among positions. Rather, each institution establishes the positions and chooses the individuals to occupy them in intricate ways. Institutions can do many things to create a pool of candidates for their positions. Policies and procedures can be designed to reduce, expand, enrich or impoverish that pool (p. 13).

Public institutions in particular receive notice in the literature regarding their weaker record of support of females in administrative careers. Ost and Twale (1989)
believe the results of their study "reaffirm the finding that women are considerably less
successful in public institutions" (p. 28). Twale (1992) contends that the public institution
is likely to reinforce credentials as the primary hiring requirement, as opposed to
expertise and competence. Stringer (1977) adds, "the higher the status of the institution,
the less likely it is that women will secure either tenures or administrative employment"
(p. 22).

Tinsley (1985) looks at the focus of institutions as they provided an educational
experience to their students, and notes a change by decades:

In the 1970s, colleges and universities were the social institutions on the
leading edge of this country's commitment to equity. In the first half of
the 1980s, colleges and universities are not focused on access and equity.
They are focused on "quality", on science and technology, and on
developing partnerships with business and industry (p. 12).

One would deduce that a diminished focus on equity could result in weaker support for
female administrators' advancement.

The levels women inhabit at institutions serve as a barrier, also, to their career
development. Moore (1984) states:

Women are pocketed in sectors of their colleges and universities that make
them less likely to build administrative careers. Faculty have traditionally
been the pool from which administrative talent has been drawn, but
women faculty are still scarce. Women are plentiful in the clerical and
technical areas, but colleges and universities have erected fairly
impermeable barriers between these areas and the higher levels of administration (p. 13).

Twale (1992) declares, “It is positioning with the academic hierarchy that connotes power and authority at the university” (p. 17). Indeed, a female’s position, and in particular its level, has significant impact on her career development. Lower level positions often do not give women administrators access to decision-making and decision-makers, nor do they guarantee appropriate learning experiences to ensure career advancement. Fennema and Ayer (1984) state:

...within professional ranks women are underrepresented at the higher levels. Thus, women are not in appropriate positions for administrative advancement. The positions they do occupy are low profile, carry little influence to affect change, and are often on the periphery of the power structure... Peripheral positions do not provide the necessary learning experiences and administrative credentials for advancement (p. 236).

This assessment is directly related to the time-in-line requirement suggested in the literature and discussed previously. Twale (1992) provides a reminder that the academic slots women may find themselves in are likely to be staff rather than line appointments, and this impacts those women: “While they gain valuable experience, they still lack the time-in-line credential favored by search committees for certain types of successive positions” (p. 17). Johnsrud and Heck (1994) researched the power that prior positions had on subsequent outcomes (promotion opportunities), and found that any initial gender bias that affected a women’s previous placement “is cumulative; when measured at the
second point in time, the total effect has substantially increased” (p. 39).

Fennema and Ayer (1984) look at career patterns for women in higher education and declare a vicious cycle exists: “Women’s lack of appropriate credentials is usually attributed to inadequate skills and abilities, which they were prohibited from learning or developing earlier in their careers” (p. 227). The authors suggest that discrimination plays a significant role in the “generally depressed career pattern” (p. 226) many women face. “Women are confronted by biased perceptions and are less likely to receive the same apprenticeship preparation for movement into administration” (p. 223). Johnsrud (1991) studied the impact of gender on administrative promotion and reports:

This study did not measure discrimination, but the findings support the consideration of discrimination as a factor in the disparate outcomes of women and men. Promotion decisions are essentially individual decisions made by hiring officials on behalf of the organization. Despite policy, procedure and mandates for equity, final personnel decisions remain in the hands of individuals responsible for matching persons and job... After removing the effects of individual and structural resources relevant to promotion and noting the persistent impact of gender, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that attitudes of decision makers are working to the detriment of women in this population (p. 144).

Johnsrud and Heck (1994) also reviewed administrative promotion, and their findings suggest:

In addition to education and experience - factors that should legitimately
account for differences in attainment - being female - a factor that should not legitimately account for differences in attainment - makes a difference. Being female is found to have significant direct effects on the prior placement of the individual in positions as well as on the status, salary, and responsibility achieved as a result of promotion (p. 39).

The authors found, as stated earlier, that prior position has an effect on future promotion and placement. But, “The initial bias against women observed in the prior position, however, is not explained by the data; that is, the findings suggest women have equivalent educational backgrounds and significantly more experience when compared to males” (p. 39). As Johnsrud and Heck (1994) summarize:

Women carry a disadvantage with them: they receive lower returns in status and responsibility (that is, significantly lower salaries and significantly more classified jobs) to their initial placement, which in turn affects their subsequent status over time. Thus, gender stratification - to the detriment of women in this organization - is both perpetuated and additive in its impact (p. 39).

Konrad and Pfeffer (1991) note that women make up a much higher proportion of the U.S. labor force than do minorities, and speculate that women “pose a greater threat of displacement to the more expensive White (sic) men. Thus, White (sic) men may act to keep women out of their jobs” (p. 155). Warner and others (1988) conclude, “That male administrators are significantly less likely than female administrators to see sex discrimination as a general barrier to advancement indicates the problematic nature of this...
issue” (p. 9). Epstein (1970), however, returns to women’s confidence levels and asserts, “If women exclude themselves from the competition for professional jobs, we cannot blame professional recruiters with discrimination” (p. 50).

Lack of sponsorship, previously discussed, is also considered to be a barrier to female administrators’ career development. Warner, et al. (1988) report from their national study of administrators:

We saw that women in nonacademic administrative positions are less likely to have been nominated or recruited for their first administrative positions. This is probably related to our finding that women are more likely to have experienced the lack of strong sponsorship and see this as a personal barrier to their advancement in administration (p. 6).

Discussion

If one was to summarize very generally the many perspectives on common career paths of women in higher education administration, one might suggest that circles of influence seem to develop. The biggest circles appear to be that of the role of socialization and that of barriers, both of which inform most decisions women must make in their lives and careers. As females find that they are expected to fulfill certain roles in society, specifically and most often that of wife and mother, they struggle with the choice attached to the expectations – choose a career or choose a family or choose both. If they elect to fit a career in, one way or another, they find that the hiring processes often work against them because of stereotypical attitudes. In some cases, they work against themselves, by limiting
their own expectations because of the limited expectations society can have of the women's capabilities.

Role model impact draws another circle of influence; females may see few women in high level administrative positions in higher education, especially those who are also married and mothers, and struggle with how to travel on the career journey without examples to follow. Often, the female administrator's mother is a key role model, and one that can confuse matters more if she was a stay-at-home mom but her daughter is thinking of a career instead. The choice between societal expectations and career desires can get forced in that regard. Grooming women to become key college or university administrators is also affected by any limit in role model (read: sponsor and mentor) availability.

The lack of extensive role modeling complicates yet another piece of the career path progress for women in higher education administration. Studies demonstrate that female administrators often do little to no career planning for themselves – a factor also influenced by socialization and barriers – and the lack of grooming compounds the problem. A woman may be unlikely to plan for her career and without a “push” from a mentor, may never get set on a clear career path in administration.

All these circles surround the career path of women in higher education administration. While a common career path is not determined with unanimity in the literature, many studies argue successfully that possessing the right terminal degree and attaining faculty experience can move a female into administrative ranks with somewhat greater ease. Women are doing their best to achieve these objectives on their career paths.
despite the negative influences that socialization and a variety of barriers present. Yet the
time-in-line requirement is prevalent and also a barrier to women's professional
advancement; as the woman works to earn her doctorate in the "right" discipline and
secure a position as faculty member to progress toward administrative opportunity,
childbearing often interrupts. Hiring officials find the interruption and/or the lesser
number of years experience to be a detracting factor as they evaluate job candidates, and
the position may then be offered to the individual without the interruption and with the
experience — and that individual is likely to be a male. More males continue to enter
administrative ranks; therefore more males are hiring officials, and literature shows that
people with hiring authority often select those candidates most like themselves and that
many males still possess stereotypical attitudes about the capabilities of females....which
means more males are likely to be hired for administrative openings.

The above summary of "circles" is indeed a generalized synthesis of what the
literature reports about women administrators' career paths in higher education. Analysis
of the literature suggests, however, that some of the theories are weakly supported by the
studies or are challenged by conflicting findings; and that other questions arise as a result
of the literature analysis.

The theories that are more consistently supported by the literature are:
socialization greatly impacts a woman's career path; and women have recognized that
appropriate academic credentials are required for advancement in academic
administration. Presenting these theories more specifically: socialization is a key factor in
women's apparent lack of career planning, career motivation and competitiveness
(Epstein, 1970; Kreps, 1974; Horner and Walsh, 1974; Stringer, 1977; Gappa and Uehling, 1979; Benton, 1980; Carlson and Schmuck, 1981; Fennema and Ayer, 1984; Evans, 1985; Mark, 1986; Williams and Piper, 1988; Twale, 1992; Carpenter and Acosta, 1992; Flynn, 1993; Warner and DeFleur, 1993; Bower, 1993; Arnold, 1994; Hill and Ragland, 1995); women's careers are more likely to be disrupted than men's, which can affect their ability to be promoted due to a disruption in the desired "time in line" approach to career development (Kreps, 1974; Evans, 1985; Warner, et al. 1988; Ost and Twale, 1989; Marshall and Jones, 1990; Twale, 1992; Warner and DeFleur, 1993; Hill and Ragland); faculty experience is the most desired prerequisite for academic administration posts (Mattfield, 1974; Graham, 1974; Stringer, 1977; Fennema and Ayer, 1984; Warner, et al. 1988; Warner and DeFleur, 1993); and such experience is unlikely to be available to women unless they have attained a terminal degree (Paul, Sweet and Brigham, 1980; Murrell and Donohue, 1982; Ironside, 1983; Moore, 1984; Wilson, 1989; Touchton, Shavlick and Davis, 1993).

As stated in the previous chapter, several studies utilize rather small samples from which findings are reported, and generalizations are difficult to accept within this context (Reeves, 1975; Freeman, 1977; Andruskiw and Howes, 1980; Moore and Sagaria, 1981; Donohue, 1981; Murrell and Donohue, 1982; McNeer, 1983; Ironside, 1983; Barrax, 1985; Evans, 1985; Williams and Piper, 1988; Clarke, 1988). Likewise, a single study's findings do not necessarily offer conclusive evidence (Freeman, 1977; Arnold, 1994).

It is apparent that the studies on women's career paths in higher education administration more frequently focus on the traditional academic administration posts,
such as dean, academic vice president and president, rather than on non-academic posts such as athletic director, dean of students and registrar. Those studies also direct more attention to attainment of top-level positions, instead of including research on assistant and associate levels (Mattfield, 1974; Pfiffner, 1975; Freeman, 1977; Andruskiw and Howes, 1980; Donohue, 1981; Murrell and Donohue, 1982; McNeer, 1983; Ironside, 1983; Atteberry, 1985; Williams and Piper, 1988; Moore, 1988). It is therefore difficult to summarize women’s career paths in higher education administration, since academic administration is only one of a variety of administrative divisions at most institutions. Some studies may include more non-academic administrative posts in their research, but the definitions of what administrative positions were actually included are not made clear.

While it appears that a common career path for academic administration exists, on the basis of consistent findings (that is, movement from faculty appointment to a department chairperson position to dean’s post to academic vice president/provost to president) (Paul, Sweet and Brigham, 1980), other authors dispute this by stating there is no single career ladder for women to ascend (Freeman, 1977; Moore and Sagaria, 1981; Donohue, 1981; Murrell and Donohue, 1982; Ironside, 1983; Evans, 1985). It appears through most of the relevant studies that fewer role models exist for women administrators and that mentoring can be critical to a woman’s career advancement (Epstein, 1970; Nieboer, 1975; Acr, 1977; Gappa and Uehling, 1979; Paul, Sweet and Brigham, 1980; Carlson and Schmuck, 1981; McNeer, 1983; Ironside, 1983; Barrax, 1985; Evans, 1985; Williams and Piper, 1988; Twombly and Moore, 1991; Sagaria and Johnsrud, 1992; Warner and DeFleur, 1993; Bower, 1993, Hubbard and Robinson, 1994).
However, as Merriam, Thomas and Zeph (1987) point out, definitions of mentoring vary from study to study. Some of the studies that cite mentoring as valuable also state that many of the women administrators' mentors were male (Freeman, 1977; Ironside, 1983; Barrax, 1985; Shere, 1990; Bower, 1993; Hubbard and Robinson, 1994), which challenges the need other studies present for female role models to be widely available in order for women to advance in higher education administration.

The "right" advanced degree for administrative promotion was examined in some studies. Although the Ph.D. is widely respected and often recommended to administrators for career advancement, two studies report that a large number of male college presidents had earned an Ed.D. degree (Wilson, 1989; Touchton, Shavlick and Davis, 1993), and one study reports that more male than female administrators have earned the Ed.D. (Moore, Twombly and Martorana, 1985). A couple of studies report that male administrators earn their terminal degrees in a variety of disciplines including the arts and sciences, as opposed to earning them primarily in education (Warner, et al.1988; Warner and DeFleur, 1993). Some researchers therefore caution women aspirants to higher education administration not to pursue a doctorate in education, but in another discipline instead (Moore, 1984; Warner, et al. 1988; Warner and DeFleur, 1993). However, some studies that explore hiring practices for higher education administrators have reported that search committee members tend to seek a candidate who is much like the members themselves; the studies also report that search committees have often been more male in majority representation, and therefore seek to hire males. This would suggest that the type of doctoral degree earned may have less impact on hiring decisions than that of gender.
Although this synthesis was not intended to focus on the topic of discrimination, it is inevitably cited or suggested through a significant number of the studies that were consulted. The argument was often made, directly or indirectly, that since so many women had supposedly done what it takes to advance in administration - earn their doctorates in education, delay or cancel childbearing, and find a sponsor to support their movement toward promotion - their lack of proportional representation among administrative ranks suggests that discrimination must be the primary barrier to advancement (Pfiffner, 1975; Hemming, 1982; Fennema and Ayer, 1983; Johnsrud, 1991; Touchton, Shavlick and Davis, 1993; Bower, 1993; Johnsrud and Heck, 1994). Yet a few studies report that discrimination is not the significant factor in a women’s inability to attain promotion (Andruskiw and Howes, 1980; Ironside, 1983; Bower, 1993). Some studies suggest that a woman’s fear of success or lack of career planning can be equally as damaging as any discriminatory attitudes the woman may encounter on her career journey (Epstein, 1970; Freeman, 1977, Paul, Sweet and Brigham, 1980; Warner, et al. 1988).

The lack of career planning by women administrators is documented in a number of studies, suggesting that this may be a factor in women’s apparent slow progress in climbing administrative ranks (Epstein, 1970, Pfiffner, 1975; Murrell and Donohue, 1982; Ironside, 1983; Evans, 1985; Williams and Piper, 1988; Hill and Ragland, 1995). The career planning that males appear to do may be the basis for some of these studies’ conclusions, which therefore holds women to a male standard. It is sociologically expected that women will ascend a career ladder in the same way as men, yet one would
question if women are provided the same support and face similar circumstances in their career journey.

A pervasive challenge to developing a synthesis on female higher education administrators is the lack of consistency in the backbone of studies conducted; specifically, some studies examine women administrators only (Reeves, 1975; Pfifner, 1975; Freeman, 1977; Touchton and Shavlick, 1978; Moore and Sagaria, 1981; Donohue, 1981; Murrell and Donohue, 1982; McNeer, 1983; Ironside, 1983; Dublon, 1983; Atteberry, 1985; Evans, 1985; Williams and Piper, 1988; Shere, 1990; Konrad and Pfeffer, 1991; Carpenter and Acosta, 1992); and some compare both male and female administrators (Paul, Sweet and Brigham, 1980; Andruskiw and Howes, 1980; Barrax, 1985; Mark, 1986; Sagaria, 1988; Warner, et al. 1988; Clarke, 1988; Moore, 1988; Ost and Twale, 1989; Twombly and Moore, 1991; Johnsrud, 1991; Twale, 1992; Sagaria and Johnsrud, 1992; Warner and Defleur, 1993; Johnsrud and Heck, 1994; Hubbard and Robinson, 1994). Findings are presented that presume a comparison in career activity between male and female administrators, yet studies may not have included survey analysis of males.

The literature on career paths of women in higher education administration is fairly significant in quantity, yet the number of obvious generalizations resulting from it are more limited. Comparative studies are not always consistent, and the focus is much greater on academic administration than other areas of administration. It is clear that most administrators in the academic area, male and female, have moved from doctorate to faculty to administrative positions. It is also clear that sociological issues have often
created barriers for women seeking administrative advancement in higher education, and women have contributed to the problem of weak representation in administrative ranks by not engaging in career planning. The literature does support the contention that many social factors influence women’s career decisions, although some argue the factors are influenced primarily by discrimination. Female administrators have demonstrated they can often be confused about role expectations, as well as ambivalent about career success. Colleges and universities also play a controlling role in determining an administrative career. Ayer (1984) believes, “It is not the truly accomplished, equally competent women who often succeeds, but merely one who is acceptable for the wrong reasons to the prevailing power structure” (p. 235).
CHAPTER IV
LEADERSHIP CHARACTERISTICS OF WOMEN IN HIGHER EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION

Definitions of Leadership

The study of leadership has a lengthy history with a series of outcomes, which have generated numerous leadership theories. The complexities of leadership studies are many, and Birnbaum (1988) capsules well the particular problems associated with leadership studies in the academy:

Most studies of leadership have taken place in business organizations, the military, and governmental agencies, with little attention given to higher education. The study of leadership is even more difficult in colleges and universities than in other settings because of the dual control systems, conflicts between professional and administrative authority, unclear goals, and the other unique properties of professional, normative organizations. In particular, the relationship between those identified as leaders and those whom they presume to lead is problematic...In higher education, there is a strong resistance to leadership as it is generally understood in more traditional and hierarchical organizations; in particular, in most institutions it may be more appropriate to think of faculty as constituents than as followers (p. 22).
More than ten years later, Birnbaum (1999) continues to speak of the complexities of leadership:

We write countless books and articles about leadership. Yet despite the enormous attention we give to leadership, we still disagree about its meaning, how it should be exercised, how individuals should be prepared for it, or what its consequences are (p. 16).

It is not surprising, then, to find a varied set of leadership definitions among female administrators in higher education. Most of the research that examines women administrators does not provide findings on how these women defined leadership; that is, much research did not include a literal definition of what leadership is, according to women administrators. But actions of an administrator often tell the story of her view on leadership, and some of the literature does “suggest” definitions through the qualitative research that has been conducted. There does not appear to be a “female” definition of leadership in higher education, however.

Of those studies that do address the women administrators’ leadership definitions, a number of them include a theme of collaboration. The former president of Wellesley College and current president of Duke University, Nan Keohane, describes a new kind of power that she perceives may develop, called “collaborative authority” (Bennett and Shayner, 1988, p. 38). This approach will be a mutually empowering one, and it claims the strengths of females blended with the traits considered to be traditionally male.

Another academic leader speaks of how leadership roles are changing; Dr. Pamela Fisher, chancellor of the Yosemite Community College District, states that, “What it takes to be effective is different [today], it requires a more collaborative and open style” (Rigaux,
Sandler and Hall (1986) acknowledges, however, that the more collaborative (“open-to-discussion”) (p. 7) leadership style can be perceived as a sign of weak leadership.

This collaborative approach to leadership is perhaps a different way of expressing a more people/relationship-oriented definition of leadership. The research also includes some female views of leadership that take this approach. Bensimon (1991) examined the feminist reinterpretation of a president’s definition of leadership, comparing a male and a female president’s definitions. The female president states, “The leader must assimilate and articulate the goals, massage, and re-orient them some, and by doing this, by nudging, the leader can move the organization in the direction of the goals” (p. 470). Bensimon points out that the president focuses on the institution, not herself, in this definition; “her identity as leader depends on becoming a part of the university.” She sees the university as a human organization, “and implies that the basis of academic leadership is the union between the leader and the university.” Cook (1997) states, “Effective leaders don’t give away their power. Instead, they help others find and use power from many sources. By spreading rather than relinquishing power, they keep the school strong to confront conflict without oppression or chaos” (p. 8). Edwards-Wilson’s (1998) research on African-American female leaders in higher education finds that these presidents used the following terms when defining leadership: displays vision, inspires, team player, provides resources and empowers others. In the analysis that will follow later in this chapter on female leadership characteristics, more of the collaborative, relationship approach will be demonstrated.
A few researchers, and leaders, choose to define leadership in broader senses. Ironside’s study (1983) finds that the female administrator sees her field as requiring a broad combination of qualities, abilities and skills. Arnold (1994) described a conversation with a prominent female leader in higher education, who says, “I think we need leadership broadly, not just in creative, inventive practice. I also think that expecting people to be a leader alone, and not as a leader of a team, is narrowing” (p. 102). She believes that past definitions of leadership focused on “heroes,” which eliminated other talent development as leadership potential. Arnold also reports that this woman describes leaders as “bold” and “quiet,” and feels that effective leaders in higher education often “have a good corporate sense” (p. 103). She also accepts entrepreneurship as a form of leadership.

As these definitions are described in the literature, a reminder is presented about the context of leadership definitions. Bensimon (1991) contends “If the study of leadership starts with the premise that it is a socially constructed phenomenon, gender must be taken into consideration” (p. 468). Chliwniak (1997) states more specifically that leadership has been studied using male norms as the standard for leadership behavior and characteristics, and Friesen (1983) reminds researchers that nowhere is a “great woman” (p. 224) theory of leadership found. The newsletter for academic deans and department chairs, “Academic Leader” (no author, February 1989) states:

The social science literature does provide one disturbing and revealing bit of research that’s helpful...Lists of adjectives such as “decisive,” “tough,” “quick,” and so on were regarded as positive descriptions of men in leadership positions, but negative when applied to women. This deep and often unexamined set of
expectations limits our concept of leadership, as well as our sense of the capacities of both men and women (p. 1).

Traits associated with leadership have been linked to male traits. Definitions of leadership held by female administrators may therefore reflect some of this socialization, and this may also be the reason some women have chosen to redefine leadership in higher education.

Female Leadership Characteristics

On the topic of leadership and women administrators in higher education, "leadership characteristics" appear to receive more significant review. A number of the studies make a comparison by gender (among them, Andruskiw and Howes, 1980; Mark, 1984; Cimperman, 1986; Gill, 1992; and Kilson, 1996); some present findings that indicate leadership traits are similar in males and females (such as Milner, King and Pizzini, 1979; Gips and others, 1984; and Wheeler and Tack, 1989); many indicate that women have adapted a leadership style that emulates male leaders (including Mark, 1984; Stokes, 1984; and Chlowniak, 1997); and some conclude that women do in fact lead differently than men (Weaver, 1978; Leonard, 1981; and Riguax, 1995 are some examples). Other studies do not address gender comparisons, but present findings on characteristics of groups of women leaders in higher education, including Thurston, 1975; Reisser, 1988; Touchton, Shavlik and Davis, 1993; and Arnold, 1994.

Among all the literature, there does not seem to be definitive consensus that particular leadership characteristics are commonly demonstrated by women in higher education administration. (The style of decision-making employed by female administrators, however, is discussed further later in this chapter, and there does seem to
be a greater indication of distinction between male and female decision-making styles.)

There do appear to be some common themes of leadership characteristics that surface among the studies, however.

One of these themes is the blending of leadership traits generally considered traditionally male and female. Some of the studies promote this blending, suggesting that an outcome of an androgynous leadership style is both likely and desirable. Others argue that the blending represents female administrators' concession to a male-dominated field of administration, as well as a societal acceptance of male leadership traits as most successful in administration. Freeman (1977) insists:

I agree with a few other researchers, that women should not take on the “male” characteristics, but should give a generous transfusion of typical “female” attributes to the administrative world to make it a better place in which to function — humanity, consideration, self-sacrifice, cooperation, altruism, gentleness, yes, even love (p. 24).

Hill and Ragland (1995) offered a more tempered view:

When considering the characteristics and lists of competencies needed in an organizational leader, several writers have fallen into a detrimental trap by labeling competencies as male or female. By giving gender categories to these characteristics, we impede progress at finding the best leaders (p. 49).

In their review of the role of women in community college administration, Loomis and Wild (1978) imply that a male-oriented definition of leadership exists when they speak of the redefinition of administration. They recommend that women in top administrative positions can bring about changes in the way the administrative role is
handled. By exercising “attributes typically described as female,” (p. 10) the authors suggest that the women leaders can redefine administration to “accommodate” these attributes. They proceed to list examples of the attributes:

...first, a deep concern about humanity and human values; second, the qualification of sophisticated understanding of social, economic and political elements and problems of our times, including an understanding of the relation of her own work to that setting; third, humility, which implies great tolerance of other persons and their ideas; fourth, an ability to communicate with others; and fifth, a willingness to be mobile – within a school system, between school systems and in other ways (p. 10).

Acry (1977) laments, “All too often women professionals try to emulate men and lose that unique opportunity and responsibility to further humanize our organizations “ (p. 47). She, too, seems to suggest that there is a male leadership style that dominates, and it is implied that this style does not support a human approach to managing. Chliwniak (1977) goes further in commending female attributes as preferred leadership traits:

When cross-referencing postmodern, nonhierarchical leadership theories and models with gender-related research and scholarship, it becomes evident that the gender-related characteristics, described as innate to most women, encompass the very characteristics leadership theorists claim to be most effective (p. 2).

Hughes (1988) admonishes, “The overarching goal is for women as a whole to preserve those qualities uniquely attributed to women and to develop their unique contributions to the world of leadership and power” (p. 64).
However, others refrain from stating that “female attributes” should be emphasized, and suggest instead that these traits be combined with “male traits.” Harter (1993) says, “the nurturing, supportive training of women needs to be blended with (not sacrificed for) the no-nonsense, traditional assertiveness of male counterparts; competency at traditional male activities (budgeting, labor relations, finance, legislative liaison) needs to be demonstrated” (p. 26). She advocates that women need to learn to become “political” because learning where the real power is can only happen if the female enters “arenas” occupied by successful, influential men. In speaking of women who perceive themselves to be effective higher education administrators, Ausejo (1993) reports that these women “align themselves with both feminine and masculine behavioral characteristics.” She contends that they “have the best of both worlds,” and those women who err too much on the side of the male manager find themselves in a quandary because “no one may appreciate their ‘enlightened’ position” (p. 81). Lester and Chu (1981) insist that women must adopt masculine attributes, and considers the blending as the means to making the women “androgynous” (p. 177). Ayer (1984) also admonishes:

Women have to learn the art of politics and what to do as well as what not to do. They must learn institutional folkways and informal networks of power and become skilled in manipulation of the formal power structure. To have such aspirations requires that a woman be androgynous, with a high spirit of adventure and a willingness to be nontraditional (p. 237).

Many researchers who study women in higher education administration have found that women have adopted male traits and male leadership styles, more out of necessity than total choice. The dominance and acceptance of leadership as a male field
greatly contributes to this. Mark's (1984) survey of higher education administrators finds that females consistently scored higher than males in describing themselves as more "masculine," more "feminine," and more "neutral." This finding, Mark says, "suggests that these females may have shaped themselves after a 'masculine model' in order to succeed in their jobs" (p. 31). She does not see such an accommodation for males in her study. Stokes' (1984) survey of female higher education administrators also finds that some women have adapted their leadership style to be more "male":

About one-third (52) of the respondents acknowledged making adaptations...which included a variety of changes, but particularly: downplaying emotions, striving for perfection, and being less direct in making suggestions and criticisms. Other changes mentioned less often were: having to be a tougher or more assertive manager, maintaining flexibility in style, downplaying one's approach in order to appear less threatening, and being more feminine (p. 11).


Lester and Chu (1981) find through their study that "women administrators may have incorporated additional masculine traits, such as self-reliance, ambition and assertiveness in order to succeed in their non-traditional role" (p. 176). They go on to conclude:

A general pattern which emerges from the comparisons of sexes within each of the three groups is that as women become more career-oriented, they become
more masculine; however, men do not seem to alter their sex-role orientation by becoming more feminine (p. 177).

Among the traits referenced in the literature that are defined as traditionally “feminine,” the characteristic of concern is associated specifically with women administrators. In some cases, seeking consensus is an outcome of the concern displayed. This characteristic of concern is not often cited when male leadership characteristics are reviewed in the literature.

Albino (1992) advises women who are higher education leaders to employ their concern for others and their desire to seek consensus, and sees these characteristics as innate in females; “In general, women should present their ideas confidently and assertively, but they should also use their naturally collaborative and supportive style to elicit others’ feelings about their ideas” (p. 50). Rigaux (1995) refers to the opinion of one interim president about her generation of women leaders: “We use more coalition building” (p. 7). Witmer (1995) presents the “process” words that she states are favored by women administrators and that reflect their style of leadership: interaction, access, flow, conduit, involvement, network, reach. She suggests that these words emphasize relationships as well as qualities such as encouraging participation, sharing power and information, and enhancing other people’s self-worth. She adds that females who employ a transformational style of leadership give others credit and praise, often giving public recognition and sending notes of recognition.

A series of studies also present findings to support the theory that female administrators exercise care and seek collaboration in their leadership behavior. Leonard (1981) reports in a study of male and female administrators that women gave slightly
more of their time to others than did men. When asked to describe the skills these leaders felt they possess, the men explained that “they were good at working with others, at delegating responsibility..., and at organization” (p. 11). The female administrators cited their skills as “concern for others and consideration for the feelings of others” (p. 11). When asked if they shared their attitudes concerning departmental issues with their colleagues, the women responded with a definite yes while the men offered a qualified yes (p. 12). Gill (1986) reports from her small study of mid-level male and female administrators that, “There does appear to be a difference among male versus female directors on the importance of human relationships at work. The women were consistently high on relationship and task whereas men tended to be low on relationships” (p. 13). Wheeler and Tack (1989) examined the leadership behaviors and attitudes of female college presidents, and report that “women try harder to achieve consensus” (p. 19). Wheeler and Tack conjecture about this behavior:

Possibly, women understand that in order to survive in the office they must at least attempt to get various constituencies to reach agreement. Moreover, they may feel that the only way consensus can be achieved is through active participation and involvement of constituent groups (p. 19).

Weaver-Lariscy and others (1991) studied male and female public relations administrators in higher education institutions. They report that “checking impact by listening to opinions at meetings” (no pagination) is characteristic of the female professionals. Grossman and Ross (1991) performed a study of the management styles of registrars and admission officers (male and female), and report a similar interest in seeking consensus, but state that female registrars are more “Democratic” (p. 87) than
their male counterparts. Jenkins (1996) reports on the presentation made at a recent
Women in Higher Education conference about a dissertation study on the influence of
gender on campus leadership styles. The study shows that women are more likely than
men to see themselves as negotiators and facilitators, and more likely to evaluate
themselves based on faculty and staff morale. Edwards-Wilson (1998) conducted
research on African-American female college presidents, asking them to describe
themselves as leaders. “The presidents generally practice a participatory, team oriented
leadership style” (p. 6). A number of female provosts respond to questions about being
women administrators in higher education, and “several of them describe themselves as
collaborative problem-solvers who are good at juggling many tasks – traits often ascribed
to women” (Lively, 2000a, p. 35). The president of Wheaton College states, “The best
decisions come not from votes, but after hearing a variety of voices. That’s a way of life
when women are in charge” (Cook, 2000, p.7).

Weaver (1978) conjectures about the origin of a woman administrator’s focus on
consensus, stating that women “acquire special skills in interpersonal relationships,” and
can reach their goals in ways men do not. Women, Weaver claims, are:

Sensitive to the emotional state of those with whom they deal. They are trained as
diplomats from the cradle and they learn early to redefine issues so they may be
viewed from a fresh perspective and find that differences may be thus resolved (p.
4).

Along with traits of concern and consensus-building, the literature also cites
committee work and service when reviewing leadership styles of women in higher
education administration. Sagaria (1985) and Touchton, Shavlik and Davis (1993) report
that this interest in committee work is perhaps motivated by the desire to survive professionally. Sagaria explains that male leaders have already been the beneficiaries of their own informal network, which women do not have. Therefore, the female administrators use their role on committees as a way to make contacts and gain information. These women leaders, not surprisingly, rate institutional committee work as significantly more important than men do (p. 28). Touchton, Shavlick and Davis reviewed the backgrounds of female presidents, and found “a continuing pattern of extensive involvement in a wide range of professional areas,” and conclude, “They have clearly learned that one leadership role leads to another, and they seem to have taken on such roles throughout their careers” (p. 43). Wheeler and Tack (1989) and Edwards-Wilson (1998) also suggest that female administrators find committee work satisfying. In their study on presidents, Wheeler and Tack report that male presidents “disagreed less than women that they count committee meetings as mistakes” (p. 19). The research of Edwards-Wilson on African-American female college presidents reports that “Service and community work were very important to their sense of self” (p. 6). Weaver (1978) also reflects on what makes women good members of committees:

A committee chaired by a woman of some skill and experience is likely to accomplish its task in an expeditious manner. Committee work consists of a series of compromises as the group moves toward its goal, and the skilled chair must keep the group moving with minimum abrasion, letting most members feel that their inputs have been an integral part of the group’s accomplishment...(p. 5).

However, Moore’s study (1983) of higher education administrators finds that a slightly higher percent of men (35.8 percent) than women (31.7 percent) administrators
had been members of state or regional boards. Moore, Twombly & Martorana (1985) find in their study of community/junior college administrators that males (61.7 percent) are somewhat more likely to perceive that participation in community activities is important to career advancement than females (51.6 percent). They also find very little difference between male and female administrators regarding the average number of internal activities participation (pp. 89-90).

A myriad of other characteristics describing and impacting women in higher education administration are also presented in the literature, albeit not consistently or frequently. “Women’s intuition,” for instance, appears in the research of Ayer (1984) and Edwards-Wilson (1998). Edwards-Wilson reports that some female African-American college presidents included “intuitive” when asked to list terms describing themselves as leaders (p. 6); Ayer claims, “Women are called devious, manipulative and intuitive for good reason. They have become street-wise in academia...acting to provide for themselves in ways they themselves do not even recognize” (p. 234).

Lester & Chu (1981) find in their study of women administrators that these women show stronger pro-feminist attitudes and higher femininity scores than men (p. 177). Ironside (1983) evaluates women administrators in higher education administration as possessing a “wide range of engaging personal qualities – from warmth to wit, to sensitivity and patience, to discipline and balance” (p. 7), and describes the woman administrator as more of a “generalist” then the men she worked with (p. 13). “Academic Leader” (1989) cites Belford: “Women’s tendency to ‘optimize the whole’ gets caught between contending interest groups and power centers. Women want to make all the parts work together...” (p. 2). Milley (1991) expresses her belief that women can be successful
fund raisers in higher education because of their history of asking and doing volunteer work (p. 34). Schonwetter and others (1993) report their study's finding that women administrators demonstrated higher time urgency scores than their male counterparts. Because of women's "traditional acculturation," Harter (1993) argues that women administrators enter leadership roles with less sophisticated organizational experiences, and are therefore "more vulnerable to making naïve mistakes" (p. 24).

Harter (1993) also presents environment as impacting a woman administrator's leadership style. "Women,...products of a different environment and different expectations, find themselves at a loss to understand and integrate themselves easily into the managerial milieu" (p. 24). Jones (1987) also reports on the impact of environment:

Different social environments experienced by women during their indoctrination into educational administration may have caused...differences in female leadership style. Having been nurtured in an environment that was much more receptive to female leaders, younger women administrators may be developing different styles of leadership than older women, who were nurtured in a more restrictive, male-dominated work environment (p. 3).

While this variety of characteristics are included throughout the literature, so, too, is the finding that women in higher education administration display intelligence and independence and confidence. Mark (1981) refers to high degrees of autonomy, intelligence, independence and inner-directedness as findings from studies of women actively working in careers in higher education. Lester & Chu (1981) find female higher education administrators to be more self-confident than female teachers and students; Ashburn (1977) finds female higher education administrators to be more independent and
competent than other women. Ironside (1983) reports from her study that women administrators were very willing to accept responsibility, assist in tasks, be available for service and be involved. Ironside describes these women as “able to shape the opportunities that were offered to fit their own purposes” (p. 8). She summarizes the female administrator as “highly professional – loyal to her institution and devoted to her work” (p. 14). Grover (1992) summarizes the requirements for women to be effective educational leaders, which includes, “…having nerves of steel;…being able to compete in high-powered situations;…having the right answers to all questions with no space for failure” (p. 332). The results of Wheeler & Tack’s study (1989) indicate that women agree more than men that self-confidence is key to effective leadership. Mark (1984) states, “What is clear is that highly educated, high-achieving females are as likely as comparable groups of males to believe they are personally responsible for their own success” (p. 43).

Nieboer (1975) offers this reminder: “The qualities associated with top-level administrators and executives are also associated with masculinity, and thus are believed to be inconsistent with femininity. These qualities are, of course, competition, independence, competence, intellectual achievement, and leadership” (p. 99). Because of this socialization to male leadership qualities and definitions, women leaders’ characteristics can also be misunderstood or misinterpreted. Reeves (1975) speaks to the impact of the women’s movement, for instance, in her analysis of job satisfaction of women administrators in higher education: “The administrators believe that they are now being viewed as a threat instead of respected for their abilities, a happier situation which existed for them in the past” (p. 135). When women conceal their knowledge and abilities
to avoid being “threatening,” Ayer (1984) says they appear as “less able, less assertive, and as less capable of leadership” (p. 233). Dale (1973) says that when women are vital and assertive, they are perceived as “bitches” who are out to get men, yet if they are quiet and unassuming, they are presumed to not amount to much. As a result of her study of top-level women administrators in Washington D.C., Freeman (1977) concludes that the female administrator who is friendly risks being thought of as flirting; the woman who acts weak is treated as a “little sister” instead of as a peer; the woman who asks for help is labeled “needy;” and the female administrator who gets angry is seen as competitive, in an unflattering way (p. 15). Freeman also contends:

Although the institution of higher education places high value on the expression of feelings, when a woman shows her feelings or advocates its expression, emotionality on the part of the women administrator becomes identified as female behavior (p. 20).

Ayer (1984), among others, refers to women’s communication vehicles as likely to be liabilities in their efforts to ascend to leadership roles:

Women’s body language, words, and gestures create an aura of uncertainty. Consequently, women do in fact become less able, less assertive, and less experienced as leaders, all of which contributes to the development of low self-concepts and self-abnegation. Women are often judged to be ill-prepared because of their behavior, and it is only in recent times that a woman who displays traditionally masculine behaviors is viewed as healthy (p. 233).

Sandler and Hall (1986) also views the female administrators’ communication styles as prone to misinterpretation, as well as devalued. These women may thus often be
perceived as “less knowledgeable and competent, and their comments as less worthy of attention and response. Additionally, some of these communication behaviors may be misinterpreted” (p.12). North (1991) cites research that suggests “certain deferential speaking patterns associated with women make them seem less knowledgeable in group decision-making situations” (p. 48). Kenny (1992) makes a related suggestion:

According to experts, women often communicate differently from men, and because faculty members and business executives are used to the way male leaders communicate, that complicate matters. I am not suggesting that women imitate men’s mode of communication, but they must think seriously about how best to make themselves understood. Their style should be their own – but it must convey the message. And therefore it must be comprehensible to people used to hearing a different “language” (p. 61).

Some researchers also cite another characteristic as common to women administrators: working hard. In Stokes’ (1984) study on organizational barriers and their impact on women in higher education, one of the barriers cited frequently by respondents was “Women have to work twice as hard and expend more energy than the average man in order to succeed” (p. 8). Williams and Piper (1988) cite a dean’s observation that men know how to compete but also how to work together, and that women need to learn to do that rather then “push by themselves” (p. 33). Schonwetter and others (1993) reflect that the higher time urgent scores women demonstrate could be a consequence of the expectations to outperform males just to achieve or maintain similar levels of professional success. Perhaps related to this perception of needing to work harder is Mark’s (1984) research that finds males believing more than females that “Ease of Task”
was a reason for their job success. Mark speculates that the females may have thought their jobs were more challenging and difficult than males'. Weaver (1978), however, is quite clear about women administrators' work ethic:

There is a general opinion among the women administrators that women were on the whole harder working than men. Any person at the top has to have unusual reserves of energy, and the woman in high gear can truly be remarkable. It may be the result of the rather stringent selection that goes on – so few women get to the top that only the extraordinarily energetic one makes it there. Part of what drives her is a determination that no one be able to say that she was too weak or frail for the job. In addition, women are brought up to handle a variety of jobs more or less simultaneously. Most administrators complain that it is difficult or impossible to put in sustained work on any one matter, since the nature of the job is to fragment effort. However, a woman who has made it into administration has learned to juggle a lot of different things… (p. 7).

Stringer (1977) also speaks to women administrators’ work ethic, citing the different expectations college communities have of male and female leaders. She suggests that males believe that whatever they do is acceptable, and their colleges seem to expect the male’s actions to be “competent.” But women seem to be under a different set of expectations. Using Goucher College as testimony, Stringer states that several women administrators “worked 12 hour days as a matter of course while their male colleagues rarely stayed late or came in early” (p. 24). Stringer says that the women therefore overworked themselves and could not exhibit the daytime patience and cheerfulness the men did, who were rested. “I had the impression that these women were responding to
subtle expectations that they have top-flight credentials, be near-geniuses, and try twice as hard as their male colleagues just to be considered in the running with a mediocre man” (p. 24). Glazer-Raymo (1999) reacts to hiring announcements of female presidents, in which physical appearance and style of dress are mentioned, by stating, “Such commentary reinforces the assumption that women who compete in a man’s world gain equal status by exceeding traditional standards of excellence and being pathfinders in their chosen careers while retaining their femininity and attractiveness” (p. 148).

While the research presented thus far focuses on female-specific traits, or the differences between male and female leadership styles, some studies also find that there are traits shared by both men and women. Some suggest there is little to no difference between male and female leaders in higher education administration. Milner, King and Pizzini (1979) report from their research on the leadership behavior of department heads in physical education that:

Male and female heads of department perceived desirable leadership behavior of an ideal head in a similar way. This suggests that a similar model of leadership practice is held by both men and women... Heads of neither sex viewed their actual leadership behavior as ideal, indicating that both sexes set themselves higher standards of leadership behavior than they felt they actually attained. Both male and female heads of department perceived their actual leadership behavior in a similar way (p. 119).

They conclude, “There is no evidence that persons of either sex are better suited to perform leadership functions in different types of department structure” (p. 120). Gips and others (1984) state their finding rather simply regarding women as team players: “In
fact individual women are seen as team players by themselves and by those with whom they work; their behavior is hardly different from the behavior of males in similar positions” (p. 10). Gill (1986) contends on the basis of her study, “It can be concluded that women directors are just as task-oriented as male directors” (p. 15). Jones (1985) studied leadership styles of community/junior college administrators, and his findings indicate that “there are no overall differences in the leadership styles or effectiveness of male and female administrators” (p. 44). Cimperman (1986) also states in her study of administrators in vocational technical colleges that the self-perceptions of leadership style by male and female administrators are the same. Ironside (1983) reports from her qualitative study that the female administrator, in general, did not have a very different approach to leadership than did her male colleagues. The research on male and female college presidents by Wheeler and Tack (1989) finds that both genders “maintain similar overall leadership behavior and attitudes” (p. 19). They suggest that the differences in responses in the study seem to come from the number of years experience in higher education administration, rather than gender. Jenkins (1996) reports on dissertation research which also finds that women in top administrative posts in higher education do not have a distinctly different leadership style than their male peers. “Their leadership style correlates more with position than with gender” (p. 21). The African-American female presidents who Edwards-Wilson (1998) studied support the previous research which states that such leaders “adopt the leadership characteristics of the culture at the institutions where they serve” (p. 5).

When Leonard (1981) examined the managerial styles of men and women in academia, the results of her study indicate that both men and women consider “listening
to others” (p. 12) as their primary style in a meeting. Grossman and Ross (1991) find that middle managers in admission, both male and female, use the “Democratic” (p. 85) management style most frequently and with the same percentage of frequency.

Dziech (1983), however, takes a much more radical and minority opinion approach to the analysis of gender-based characteristics in higher education administration. She contends that studies that emphasize gender typing prove and accomplish little:

It is no service to female educators to assert unequivocally that they are different from their male peers, to imply that “feminine” characteristics are the source of their ills and that their success is contingent either on mastering “male” behaviors or transforming the institution into some nebulous “female” image. One does not eliminate a stereotype by exaggerating its pervasiveness. There are no impressive data to prove that women who choose academic careers fit traditional female stereotypes. In fact, common sense suggests that women deliberately electing a male-dominated profession are probably anything but docile, passive, and dependent (p. 62).

The research that has been conducted on the leadership styles of women administrators in higher education has varied considerably in the findings. Some of the studies make specific gender comparisons and report both that there is no difference as well as that there is a difference in the leadership characteristics male and female administrators exhibit. Other studies focus on women administrators only, and suggest that the findings are specific to those women without applying similar studies to men.
Role of Personal Values in Leadership Development

The literature on leadership characteristics of women in higher education administration suggests that values may play a role in the development of a leadership style for these women. The "values" cited in the literature most frequently refer to: a responsibility to humanity; a responsibility to family; a responsibility to other women.

Because of the influence of socialization, it might be presumed that women's commitment to family is a value rather prevalent among women administrators. This value was cited in studies, but not cited frequently. Reisser's (1988) survey of female community college administrators finds that a substantial number of female administrators give serious consideration to resigning from their positions:

The reasons they give are not those commonly associated with sex discrimination, such as discomfort with salary, position, status, or authority, gender equality, proportion of men to women in key positions...Interviewees spoke often about the need to evaluate priorities, and were unwilling to sacrifice their commitment to family and professional growth in order to move up the career ladder (p. 13). Kilson (1996) reports on a survey of graduate deans, which finds that more women than men "consider family a principal non-professional involvement." She adds, "Moreover, 19% women, especially younger women, claim insufficient time for personal life as a career frustration in contrast to 3% men" (p. 4).

Most of the value influence in leadership development that is cited in the literature refers to responsibility to humanity, and to women. The latter is largely attributed to a commitment to advocacy of women. In assessing the woman administrator from her qualitative study, Ironside (1983) offers this description:
Essentially, her view was that in being uncommon she had a special opportunity to be a visible role model. Hence, her greatest responsibility to other women, as well as to herself, was to do her work exceedingly well and to be recognized as a highly competent professional in her chosen field. That, she firmly believed, would be the real feminist victory (p. 14).

Gill's (1992) study on the perception of advocacy issues of women versus men finds a "growing sense of women supporting other women" (p. 25). She reports that the majority of respondents perceive women advocating more for other women than men. Touchton, Shavlik and Davis (1993) present a descriptive study of college and university presidents, in which they report that 94 percent of the respondents agreed that "it was important for them to demonstrate concern for the status of women on their campuses" (p. 33). They also report that most of these female presidents agree that it is essential to alter the curriculum to include new scholarship on women.

Embracing a commitment to social responsibility, or a responsibility to humanity, is referenced more in the literature, although not consistently. This level of responsibility includes issues of equity, relationships and rewards. Gill (1992) finds that women are perceived as stronger advocates than men on the following, and therefore consider these to be of special importance: "equity, a harassment free workplace, childcare, victim's rights legislation, flex time, enforced child support, increased funding for education, less defense spending and CHOICE" (p. 24). Harter (1993), a female, declares, "As administrators...our jobs are attuned to the well-being of the community as a whole: to the greatest good for the greatest number" (p. 23). She sees women's "nurturing values of traditional femininity" (p. 27) as most appropriate in meeting this responsibility. Cook
(1997) presents her “leading with soul” theory, urging women administrators to empower individuals, create a “community of mattering” by using these gifts of “love, power, authorship and significance.” She tells these leaders to give from their “moral core” (p. 8). Edwards-Wilson (1998) reports that African-American female presidents consider their administrative staff and subordinates as allies, people to work with in a common effort to benefit students and schools.

Touchton, Shavlick and Davis (1993) find in their study of women presidents that nearly all respondents feel it is important or very important to “mandate periodic reviews of institutional policies to eliminate sex-based bias” and to “demonstrate concern for minorities on campus” (pp. 33-34). A strong majority also agree that they should implement reviews of institutional policies to eliminate racial bias. Weaver-Lariscy and others (1991) study women administrators in the field of higher education public relations, discovering that the female practitioners in the study typically engage their staff in discussions of social responsibility issues. Weaver-Lariscy and others call this a “conscience of the organization” role for the females (p. 10). Wilcox and Ebbs (1992), cited in Chliwniak (1997), state that women have a preference for using the “care voice,” and present their conclusion that a “care-voiced” leader can ground the institution with cooperation and community through the introduction of values and ethics. Arnold (1994) includes the responses of one female higher education leader in her qualitative study who declares, “I care a lot, although of course caring is not enough by itself...I like to work from principles and criteria” (pp. 99-100).

Chliwniak (1997) reports that although position and advancement are perceived as important to job satisfaction, women value intrinsic rewards more (p. 51). Women also
appear not to value monetary rewards as much as males, according to some studies. Jenkins (1996) reports that women deans prefer performance-based raises over fixed annual raises by a ratio of 2:1, “considerably higher than male preference” (p. 21). Wheeler and Tack’s (1989) study of college presidents finds that the males emphasize monetary rewards more than females. Freeman (1977) finds in her study of top-level women administrators that “these women’s desires to contribute skills and talents to the economy were not for the financial rewards only, but to reap the psychic rewards that come from achievement, recognition and service to society” (p. 21). Thurston’s (1975) study of two-year female college presidents reports that these women find their greatest satisfaction “in solving problems and in facilitating the growth of students, staff and their institutions” (p. 119).

The literature does not definitively state that values are missing in male leadership behavior in higher education administration, however. It suggests that there are perhaps different values embraced by male and female administrators. Kaplan and Helly (1984) and Harter (1993) urge women administrators to be true to their values while remaining adaptive to the environment within which they work. Harter recommends specifically, “Women need to learn to become ‘political’ and simultaneously retain their integrity – the two are not mutually exclusive” (p. 26). Kaplan and Helly state, “A senior woman administrator must be comfortable with herself and with her values and yet adaptive enough to accept and operate within the sometimes alien surroundings” (p. 69). This research suggests that women may retain their own set of values, which may or may not “fit” the environment within which they work. It appears that the need for women administrators to be “political” and “adaptive” is a statement about male dominance in
the higher education workplace – the men are not required to be adaptive – and it
suggests that male administrators may not maintain integrity. Bennett and Shayner (1988)
feel strongly enough about this implied gender difference in leadership styles influenced
by values that they conclude:

Many may disagree, but the evidence seems to tell us that men and women do
lead differently because they enter positions of leadership with different modes
of behavior that have grown out of different value systems. Therefore, the
lessons gleaned from leadership experiences – not necessarily the outcomes, but
the processes – will be different for men and women. (p. 37)

View of Subordinates

Andruskiw and Howes (1980) state that “most organization studies have shown
that the majority of employees do not feel comfortable with women managers” (p. 478).
However, a very limited portion of the literature on women administrators in higher
education directly addresses the views of their subordinates about their leadership.
Among the studies that include such a focus, the themes that seem to surface are: positive
views; negative views; the view that men will not work for women; and a view that
subordinates see no difference in working for a male or a female.

Graham (1974) challenges the view that men do not wish to work for women, but
she does concur that the male’s view of reporting to a woman can have a more negative
perspective.

Relevant here are the widespread beliefs that men will not work for women and
that women may not wish to. Grounds for these common assertions are not
frequently cited, and facts often point the other way. For example, at two colleges
that have regularly had women presidents, Barnard and Wellesley, men have consistently numbered between 40% and 50% of the faculty, and have never seemed to mind in the least serving under a woman president (p. 246).

From the perspective of a senior university administrator, most of the women a man sees are secretaries, clerks, and junior faculty and administrative staff. Therefore, when a woman mount to high administrative rank, she faces a complex task. Not only does she have a new job to learn and relationships to cultivate, she must also legitimize the authority of her office, and gradually break down the resistance of her male associates to take supervision and direction from a woman. It is not easy for many men to change their customary expectations that women are bossed, not bosses (p. 247).

Thurston (1975) states in her study of female two year-college presidents, “Primarily men know women as mothers, sisters, wives, sweethearts; women know men as fathers, husbands, brothers and lovers. When these customary roles change, each sex fears and is threatened by the other” (p. 121).

Hersi (1993) believes that the business world theory about males working with and for females has direct application for women in higher education administration: men are more willing to support women administrators, “once these men have had experience working with and for women supervisors” (p. 33). The findings from Irvine and Robinson’s (1982) study suggest that the attitudes one has toward women in roles generally associated with men, are related to “the openness of one’s perceptions of sex-appropriate behaviors” (p. 202). Therefore, individuals who do not see their own behaviors as specifically sex typed are more accepting of women in leadership roles.
Freeman’s (1977) study of women administrators in Washington D.C. reports that the women felt men treat them as they feel about their wives. “If they were comfortable, and at ease at home and stable in their positions, they were more receptive of women administrators” (p. 20). In Lively (2000a), Nannerl Keohane states:

It’s also important for men to see women in positions of power, as they plan their own careers and lives in terms of how they look at the ambitions of their partners and how they look at [female] supervisors and coworkers. They are unlikely to see that as odd. (“Chronicle of Higher Education,” June 16, 2000, p. 34)

Milner, King and Pizzini (1979) present a study on the relationship between sex and leadership behavior of department heads in physical education, in which they find that male faculty do not recognize an “altered leadership environment...whether led by a woman or a man” (p. 120). They do not discern a specific gender preference by subordinates about their supervisors. They also state that “male and female heads of department perceived desirable leadership behavior of an ideal head in a similar way” (p. 119). However, they do report that female faculty within departments headed by women recognize “greater degrees of structure-initiating behaviors” than did women in departments with male heads (p. 120).

A number of studies imply that they are reporting views that can be attributed to subordinates, or mix a subordinate audience with peers. Self-reported views of the perceptions others have of administrators’ leadership styles also dots the literature. Leonard (1981), for instance, looks at managerial styles in academe, and reports about his subjects:
The men and women generally used different adjectives when asked to describe how others perceived them. However both groups included both jobs-related and personality-related perceptions. The women said they thought their co-workers perceived them as honest, hard-headed, human, benevolent, caring, intimidating, efficient, pushy, accessible, and as doing a good job. The men mentioned efficient, competent, fair, straight-forward, accessible, friendly, and reserved (p. 13).

Stokes (1984) implies that the women who work for women administrators can be easily discouraged by others’ treatment of these female role models, who are “constantly reminded of their marginal status” (p. 25). Gips and others (1984) surveyed 21 women administrators and their superiors, and all the administrators indicated that they considered themselves to be “team players.” They also all believed their colleagues considered them to be team players as well. The most commonly cited reason offered for this perception was that the administrators felt they were cooperative and supportive of others (p. 8). Also, 20 of the 21 supervisors agreed their subordinates were team players.

Thurston’s (1975) study of nine female two-year college presidents reports:

These women presidents were unanimous in their feeling that being a woman created no special problems in working with staff, students, their board or other constituencies. One said, ‘Being a woman doesn’t grant any immunities, however.’ ‘At first, the local men were shocked,’ was one comment. Two felt they worked more easily with men, while the others said there was no difference: ‘Other factors than gender are the relevant dynamics.’ A president who is a
Catholic sister wrote: ‘I find myself more patronized by men because I am a member of a religious order than because I am a woman’ (p. 119).

Sandler and Hall (1986) says that the woman administrator “may encounter pressure and disappointment from other women on campus, including faculty, staff and lower-level administrators who feel that women in top posts are not doing enough for them personally or for issues of concern to women on campus” (p. 14). Gill’s (1992) study has a broad respondent pool: administrators, faculty and staff. Overall these respondents perceive women as stronger advocates for issues of equity. Kilson (1996) examines responsibilities of graduate deans and relationships with supervisors; he finds that men believe they interact more frequently with their supervisors than women do. This may suggest that men, who are a majority among higher level administration and therefore more likely to be a male’s supervisor, are more comfortable with male supervisors. Finally, Jones (1993) suggests that women administrators in leadership positions can embrace a style of leadership in which women staff and students around them “become more empowered through mutual respect” (p. 66).

Gips and others (1984) also point out another interesting perspective on the relationship between manager and subordinate, although it can be argued that their observation is not truly gender-specific. They comment on the “two teams” women administrators must belong to: one is the division or department they are managing, and the other is the set of top administrators that run divisions. They report that the woman administrator can therefore face conflict: “what the top management team decides may not be what the division team had hoped for, ... then the female manager ... becomes the bearer of bad news for her division team” (p. 9).
Decision Making Traits

When reviewing the leadership characteristics of female administrators in higher education, the literature directs attention to decision-making traits of these women – not an unlikely choice since style of leadership is often defined by the leader's approach to decision-making. The literature about women administrators suggests that they are concerned with examining all sides of an issue; they seek consensus; they welcome collaboration, they exercise sensitivity and intuition; and they are willing to alter their styles of decision-making. Much of this is mirrored in the previous discussion in this chapter about leadership characteristics.

In Arnold's (1994) qualitative presentation of the views of selected women administrators, she shares the words of one leader about making decisions:

I usually try to develop a number of options and pick the one that I think will work best. It takes time, but I look for a robust solution, one that will give flexibility and will not just be an interim solution requiring a zigzag somewhere else tomorrow in an inconsistent way (p. 99).

Witmer (1995) provides her view of this style of decision-making, which she sees as "natural" for women. She contends that a male's approach to decision-making is "blunt and quick," while a woman's approach is more complex "because the female decision making utilizes more data – factual as well as emotional" (p. 163). Witmer advises the female administrator:

It is natural for you to weigh the facts, consider different dimensions, and seek alternatives if the choice is not what you believe it should be. You may not be as adept in zeroing in on a solution, but you will be better at understanding all of the
issues. Give yourself the time you need to make the best decision possible (p. 163).

Witmer (1995) also cautions women that after the lengthy examination of the decision to be made, they will likely second-guess whatever decision they do make “because you are clearly aware that very few things are absolute.” Further, she adds, “You will be likely to worry about the impact of this decision on others, even though that concern was already a part of your decision-making process” (p. 164).

Cobelli and Muth (1990) studied administrative decision-making styles in higher education, and they make reference to the role socialization has played in a woman’s style of decision-making, which they find to be somewhat tentative:

Women have been socialized to seek approval from others, and their actions and feelings of self-worth are often dependent upon such approval. Thus, women may have trouble making decisions that jeopardize the approval they have been trained to seek. In such situations, women may make no decisions, waiting until all bases are covered, or may change their decisions unnecessarily (p. 7).

Thurston (1975) studied female two-year college presidents and she reports:

We are taught more to listen than to persuade; and while a president needs to listen, she must also rely heavily on persuasion, which is often her only recourse. We are taught to value the person over the group or the institution; yet in a presidency, problems must often be resolved in terms of the best interests of a department or of the college as a whole, despite the cost to the individual. This is frequently the situation in terminating the employment of a staff person. Our people-orientation perhaps sensitizes us too much, not only to the feelings of
others but to their reactions to us. We, too, need acceptance and love; yet in a presidency this need can keep us from doing the hard things which must be done (p. 122).

The actual results of Cobelli and Muth’s (1990) study indicate that some respondents do perceive female administrators take more time to make decisions than men do. These respondents also find the woman administrators to be more attentive to detail and more process oriented than males. These female administrators were seen by these respondents as being more conscious of people in making decisions, as well as being better able to nurture colleagues and staff.

Weaver’s (1978) work, however, suggests a different approach to decision-making than what Cobelli and Muth’s (1990) does, for she states:

Women tend to simplify things. All institutions (not just those of higher education) are terribly bound up in bureaucracies and seemingly unavoidable convoluted procedures of byzantine complexity. Not knowing that a given set of procedures is “the way it is done” (and therefore sacred) women can take a fresh look and suggest short cuts in many situations when they are given the authority to do so... Several of the women with whom I spoke recounted the difficulty of getting some segments of the institutions they had recently taken over the leadership of to adopt a more direct and simple way of dealing with a recurring problem. Once accomplished, the improvement was obvious... (p. 4).

Weaver also states that women are likely to be “humane” in rendering decisions, and they try to spare the feelings “of those whose egos were involved,” and are “careful that no lasting animosities” result (p. 7).
Gips and others (1984) suggest that women struggle with implementing decisions made from the top. “It is possible that women have difficulty putting aside their need for affiliation and their need to play a supportive role. They suffer when hard decisions are made above and must be implemented within their work arenas” (p. 10). “Academic Leader” (February 1989), the newsletter for academic deans and department chairs, states that deans often find themselves in the position of not pleasing everyone, which is a hard position for women to be in given their socialization to be liked by everyone.

The more open, collaborative approach to decision-making that some of the literature reports about women administrators also reflects attention to people. Arnold’s (1994) presentation of conversations with female academic leaders includes this quote from one female leader, “I think that I have learned how to enable others to lead. I believe in that strongly and intellectually and I very much want to share the leading with other people” (p. 100). Ironside (1983) reports on qualitative data collected about women administrators in higher education, summing up the woman administrator as “an open and collaborative leader with an appreciation of the importance of teamwork” (p. 14). In her study of African-American female college presidents, Edwards-Wilson (1998) reports that in the more structured tasks, these presidents encouraged team participation. Jones (1993) reiterates the benefits of generative leadership, originally presented by Sagaria and Johnsrud (1988); under generative leadership, people are given the opportunity to learn and practice becoming leaders themselves:

Collaboration, productivity, consensus, and creativity are promoted, and the unique talents of each member of a working group are highly valued and used. The generative leadership style also offers women a way to delegate gracefully.
Everyone is valued and has a responsibility to the group, and therefore is required to perform tasks that under other leadership styles might be done only by the leader. (Jones, 1993, p. 66)

Seeking consensus is also reflected in the literature's review of female administrators' decision-making styles. Wheeler and Tack's (1989) research on the leadership behaviors and attitudes of male and female college presidents finds that female presidents "agreed to a greater extent than males that they try to achieve consensus" (p. 15). Wheeler and Tack believe that this finding supports the notion of a feminine leadership style, which they believe is the preference for a "win-win" approach rather than the traditional "win-lose" approach to problem-solving. Grossman and Ross (1991) examine the management styles of registrars and admission officers, finding that female respondents place more importance on involving staff members in decision-making. A group of female provosts were the subject of an interview about their careers as women administrators, and one provost reports,

> If a decision needs to be made immediately, I have no trouble. When I have the luxury of taking some time to make a decision, I'd rather consult. Getting buy-in is important when you're moving that quickly and taking some risks — getting the whole campus to feel they're sharing in this exciting thing.

I don't know if this is a female style or not, but I have noticed that I have a different style. (Lively, 2000a, p. 35)

Irionside (1983) contends that the woman administrator also demonstrates sensitivity, particularly when exercising decisions regarding personnel matters: "She was not overwhelmed by such problems. Her approach was to be as sensitive and non-
threatening as possible but not at the expense of the professional goals she had set for herself" (p. 14).

Weaver (1978) makes the claim that most female administrators she studied believe that women are good at decision-making and do have a "special style." "In fact, they felt that women administrators are as good as the best men, and better than most" (p. 6). She contends that a woman’s skills of diplomacy and fostering compromise add great value to the decision-making within institutions. She also states that one female president of a large state system told her, "I have not had any problems with the decision-making process, but some of my male faculty members do have problems" (p. 6). Weaver continues:

Although one woman president felt that there was no difference in the way men and women made the difficult decisions, such as those on budget or in personnel situations, most were emphatic in their belief that women were superior to many men administrators in dealing with them (p. 7).

Freeman (1977) also draws some conclusions similar to Weaver’s (1978), and points to socialization as contributing to the female’s leadership style. She reminds others that young women are taught to be “warm, expressive, dependent, creative, person-oriented and patient,” (p. 17), and by incorporating these behaviors into their leadership, they approach problems in different ways than males (p. 17).

“A woman’s intuition” also appears in some of the literature regarding leadership styles of women administrators in higher education, as it did among findings about leadership characteristics. Cobelli and Muth’s (1990) study finds some respondents view female administrators as superior to men in their use of intuition in decision-making.
However, Weaver-Lariscy and others (1991) report in their research on women in higher education public relations that “once you are a manager, your use of intuition or science to prepare, distribute and evaluate public relations materials is independent of whether you’re male or female” (p. 11).

Stokes (1984) contends that women administrators must develop particular approaches to decision-making. She reports from her study that “in order to counteract certain barriers, the woman changes behavior to more effectively influence decisions, gain recognition, and achieve credibility” (p. 20). The president of Wheaton College refuses to pigeon-hole female administrators’ leadership, stating, “With so many women leaders, it’s hard to generalize. Gender, race, class and personal experience all affect leadership style” (Cook, 2000, p. 7).

Discussion

The examination of female higher education administrators’ leadership characteristics is a complex process. The literature on this topic blends various leadership theories with feminist and sociological approaches to leadership. Some of the literature is not based on research (Graham, 1974; Stringer, 1977; Burkhardt, 1979; Kaplan and Helly, 1984; Sandler and Hall, 1986; Fobbs, 1988; Bennett and Shayner, 1988; Milley, 1991; North, 1991; Grover, 1992; Harter, 1993; Ausejo, 1993; Witmer, 1995; Rigaux, 1995; Cook, 1997); some of it reports findings from qualitative research (Reeves, 1975; Thurston, 1975; Freeman, 1977; Leonard, 1981; Hemming, 1982; Ironside, 1983; Gips and others, 1984; Cimperman, 1986; Reisser, 1988; Williams and Piper, 1988; Cobelli and Muth, 1990; Weaver-Lariscey and others, 1991; Bensimon, 1991; Arnold, 1994; Edwards-Wilson, 1998; Lively, 2000a) and some from quantitative research (Milner,
King and Pizzini, 1979; Andruskiw and Howes, 1980; Lester and Chu, 1981; Irvine and Robinson, 1982; Moore, 1983; Stokes, 1984; Gill, 1984; Mark, 1984; Moore, Twombly and Martorana, 1985; Jones, 1986; Wheeler and Tack, 1989; Grossman and Ross, 1991; Gill, 1992; Touchton, Shavlik and Davis, 1993; Schonwetter and others, 1993; Kilson, 1996); some of it summarizes previous research findings (Nieboer, 1975; Aery, 1977; Mark, 1981; Jones, 1993; Chliwniak, 1996). Some of it examines women leaders only (Reeves, 1975; Thurston, 1975; Freeman, 1977; Hemming, 1982; Ironside, 1983; Stokes, 1984; Gips and others, 1984; Reisser, 1988; Cobelli and Muth, 1990; Touchton, Shavlik and Davis, 1993; Arnold, 1994; Edwards-Wilson, 1998; Lively, 2000a), and some of it studies both genders in a comparative fashion (Milner, King and Pizzini, 1979; Andruskiw and Howes, 1980; Lester and Chu, 1981; Leonard, 1981; Irvine and Robinson, 1982; Mark, 1984; Gill, 1984; Moore, Twombly and Martorana, 1985; Jones, S., 1986; Cimperman, 1986; Wheeler and Tack, 1989; Grossman and Ross, 1991; Weaver-Lariscy and others, 1991; Bensimon, 1991; Gill, 1992; Schonwetter and others, 1993; Kilson, 1996). As has been the case with the literature reviewed in previous chapters, some studies focus on small samples (Reeves, 1975; Thurston, 1975; Freeman, 1977; Milner, King and Pizzini, 1979; Lester and Chu, 1981; Ironside, 1983; Gill, 1984; Gips and others, 1984; Reisser, 1988; Bensimon, 1991; Gill, 1992; Schonwetter and others, 1993; Arnold, 1994; Kilson, 1996).

Also, the research of this topic yielded a smaller sample of literature than was expected, especially in the areas of leadership definition, the role of personal values, and the view of subordinates. Perhaps the literature has become more limited because leadership studies are becoming more focused on leadership style issues rather than
gender differences in leadership styles – which may in turn be an outcome of the increasing number of female higher education administrators (i.e., it is no longer a novelty to have a woman boss).

It is difficult to conclude that women administrators in higher education have a different leadership style than men – or that these women have a distinct leadership style. Indeed, the research seems clouded in its focus at times. Studies may address how women lead, or what sort of things are important to them as leaders; yet a significant portion of the literature appears more intent on suggesting how women are different and/or better leaders than their male counterparts (Nieboer, 1975; Stringer, 1977; Andruskiw and Howes, 1980; Lester and Chu, 1981; Leonard, 1981; Kaplan and Helly, 1984; Gill, 1984; Ayer, 1984; Stokes, 1986; Jones, S., 1986; Wheeler and Tack, 1989; Weaver-Lariscy and others, 1991; Milley, 1991; Bensimon, 1991), while other of the literature focuses on determining the specific leadership traits women possess (Freeman, 1977; Touchton, Shavlik and Davis, 1993; Edwards-Wilson, 1998). Added complexities include the male-based definition of leadership which some researchers insist exists as the benchmark for leadership evaluation (and arguably, is therefore an unfair or inappropriate measure of female leadership effectiveness); and the elementary basis of understanding regarding leadership which suggests that to reach a leadership position, one must first possess certain characteristics that do not necessarily exist as gender-based (such as confidence and independence).

The literature does seem to indicate that there is no common female definition of leadership; that is, women administrators do not define leadership in a specific way. This may not be as much of a revelation as it is an outcome of the limited literature on the
topic, or an outcome of the complexity of leadership theory definitions. However, it does appear that definitions of “masculine” and “feminine” characteristics, as they relate to leadership (e.g., males are aggressive and competitive, women are passive and nurturing), play a role in how some women have chosen to define leadership; because they may have been socialized to link male traits with leadership traits, they may define leadership in a male framework or contrarily, in a manner that rebels against this socialization.

Male and female traits relating to leadership also impact how the literature may define female leadership characteristics. While there does not appear to be definitive consensus that particular leadership characteristics are commonly demonstrated by women in higher education administration, there are some common themes of leadership characteristics that surface, and these are often connected with trait definitions. In particular, the theory that women have “blended” traditionally male and female traits (the androgyny theory evolves from this) to develop their own leadership style is tied to proscribed gender attributes (Lester and Chu, 1981; Mark, 1984; Bennett and Shayner, 1988; Harter, 1993; Ausejo, 1993; Chliwniak, 1997). However, other than in Leonard’s (1981) and Mark’s (1984) studies, it is suggested that men do not exercise any blending. This synthesis did not examine literature pertaining to male leadership styles exclusively, so it cannot conclude that this suggestion is valid. Also, one would have to do more current research on the literature about male administrators to be certain that “modern” males, who have been socialized differently about the leadership potential of women, are not in fact exercising some blending themselves.

The characteristics that do receive fairly consistent mention relating to female higher education administrators are those of concern, collaboration and consensus-
building. A significant number of studies and narratives speak to women’s tendencies toward reaching consensus and showing concern for individuals (Thurston, 1975; Freeman, 1977; Leonard, 1981; Gill, 1884; Gips and others, 1984; Wheeler and Tack, 1989; Cobelli and Muth, 1990; Bensimon, 1991; Albino, 1992; Arnold, 1994; Witmer, 1995; Rigaux, 1995; Kilson, 1996; Cook, 1997; Edwards-Wilson, 1998). Yet it is interesting to note that few studies exist which speak to the role that values play in the development of a woman administrator’s leadership style. The regularity with which traits of consensus-building, collaboration and concern for others seem to be exhibited by women administrators are attributed more to sociology (e.g. women are taught to care for others and are anxious to please) than the females’ personal value systems. The male dominance in higher education leadership – in leadership in general – might also have an impact on women’s tendencies toward reaching consensus; Wheeler and Tack (1989) conjecture that women try to get constituencies to agree so that they might assure their survival in the workplace.

Sociology also appears to have great impact on the views that males hold about working for women administrators. It has been cited in studies (Graham, 1974; Thurston, 1975) that males – and females – see one another in prescribed roles (fathers, brothers, husbands, lovers; mothers, daughters, wives, secretaries) and when one steps out of those roles, the other gender is uncomfortable. Hence, males are more used to women “being bossed, not being bosses.” However, studies also state that males can become more comfortable with female administrators of authority when they become more and more exposed to women in such roles (Pfiffler, 1975; Weaver, 1978; Hersi, 1993; Lively, 2000a). It might be expected that if studies were conducted now on how men feel about
working with and for women administrators, more males (and especially younger men) would express more comfort with those circumstances.

Studies exist that focus on characteristics that are presumed to be specific to women, and women only are surveyed in some of the studies — yet it would seem that men might be just as likely to possess some of these characteristics as women. For instance, findings are presented regarding the importance that female administrators place on being involved in committee/community work (Wheeler and Tack, 1989; Touchton, Shavlik and Davis, 1993), but there are also studies that find that men feel committee work is important, too (Moore, 1983, Moore, Twombly and Martorana (1985). Other studies speak to the likelihood that women administrators are a different breed than other women in higher education; they are brighter, more confident and independent (Lester and Chu, 1981; Mark, 1981; Ironside, 1983; Mark, 1984). However, it can be argued that the traits such as independence and intelligence and confidence are likely to be present in leaders regardless of gender. One’s ascent to positions of authority, such as administrator in the higher education arena, presumes that those traits (among others) were responsible for their promotion in the first place. To state that common characteristics among women administrators in higher education include independence and intelligence is perhaps true, although these traits would seem to be present among males in higher education administration as well.

Another study presents the difficulty that women administrators are likely to encounter in playing dual roles — leading a team, while reporting to another leader at the same time. The example is given that the woman administrator may be asked by her supervisor to take action that will be unpleasant to those who report to her, and thus she
will find herself conflicted. It might be argued that male administrators are placed in the same position, but again, the study did not examine how males might feel about this dual role-playing.

A number of studies present findings that suggest women are more likely to advocate for, and be role models to, women in the workplace than men (Lester and Chu, 1981; Ironside, 1983; Gill, 1992; Touchton, Shavlik and Davis, 1993). While studies are needed to confirm this, the outcomes are hardly revelatory. Since women have been represented in smaller numbers among higher education administration, and they have been challenged by time-in-line interruptions, discrimination, and fewer role models – and the feminist movement has grown – it is not surprising that women would advocate for the advancement and needs of other women (Queen Bee syndrome not withstanding).

An occasional study’s (or narrative’s) validity is difficult to accept, because of reasons such as subjectivity, small sample size, and reliance on qualitative findings (Graham, 1974; Thurston, 1975; Gill, 1984; Cimperman, 1986; Cobelli and Muth, 1990; Bensimon, 1991). Stokes (1984) presents an important reminder:

There appear to be four major myths and cultural biases which distort perception about the skills and abilities of women: our erroneous notion of the average male’s abilities, bias in our perceptions of women, the influence of organizational environment on behavior of women, and our assumption about deficient on-the-job opportunities for women (p. 15).

Also, since there are few studies investigating the view subordinates hold of their female supervisors, other studies have been added to that part of this chapter which seem to
include peers and supervisors of those female administrators, not just their subordinates.

This impacts the validity of the synthesis findings, as well.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Conclusions

This synthesis examined the literature on women in higher education administration from 1970 to present; more than 260 articles, books and newsletters were consulted before the final sample of pertinent literature was selected for review. Based on the review of the literature, the principle intent of the synthesis is to integrate what the literature reports about women in higher education administration with respect to presence, career path and leadership characteristics.

The literature is a mix of works that comprise narrative pieces, empirical studies, non-empirical qualitative and quantitative research, and analyses of previous studies or research conducted. More than 80 percent of it is written by females. Some of the authors acknowledge clearly that their work is conducted within a feminist construct; that is, they explicitly seek to examine how women administrators are treated unequally, or they seek to build a new set of parameters for knowledge based on female experiences instead of male. Some examples of this include Bensimon (1991), who wrote of the feminist’s reinterpretation of a president’s leadership definition, Chliwniak (1997), who analyzed the “gender gap” in higher education, and Stokes (1984), who studied organizational barriers and their impact on women in higher education. Most of the works reflect the sociological changes taking place at the time the writers produced the literature. While some of the research makes specific comparisons with male counterparts - such as
Leonard's (1981) study on the communication styles of men and women in administration, and Gill's (1992) examination of the similarities and differences in attitudes between men and women on various advocacy issues - much of it focuses only on female higher education administrators. Small samples or opinion-based research and narratives also blend with larger, consistently conducted surveys.

Because of this complex mix of literature, the expansive timeframe that the synthesis covers (approximately 30 years), and the constant sociological change taking place within that timeframe, the integration of the literature on women in higher education is difficult to achieve. Equally challenging is the research of a topic that is not exclusive to higher education; that is, the topic of the representation and characteristics of women leaders. Indeed, this synthesis examined only the literature addressing female higher education administrators; yet frequently the studies were impacted by, and may even have included, references to other gender studies and to the status of women as business leaders.

Boyer (1991) advocates that the scholarship of integration "also means interpretation, fitting one's own research - or the research of others - into larger intellectual patterns... Those engaged in integration ask "What do the findings mean?" (p. 19). Despite the complexity of the literature on women in higher education administration, this synthesis presents the following series of interpretations as its conclusions:

- There are Chronological Patterns in the Literature's Evolution. This synthesis examines the literature on women higher education administrators that was produced in the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s. Although the approach of the synthesis is more thematic than
chronological, it is apparent that patterns develop in the literature that can be categorized into those decades.

The 1970s introduced an expanded degree of self-awareness by women about their place in higher education administration; this paralleled the examination women were conducting about their place in society in the 1970s. The woman’s movement and the advent of affirmative action are testimony to this growing self-awareness.

Moore and Wollitzer (1979) summarize the early evolving state of research on women in higher education:

By 1978 there can be no question that the place of women in the academic world has emerged as a highly significant issue. Research has burgeoned in response to the stimulus of affirmative action programs, but also because academic women themselves have begun to examine their condition using the research skills with which they were trained (p. 1).

The literature about females in higher education administration in the 1970s presents a disconcerting picture of the status of women administrators. Women comprised more than half of the enrollments at U.S. colleges and universities, but the proportion of women in full-time higher education administrative positions was just over 23 percent. Less than 200 of the nation’s colleges and university presidencies were held by females. Females were more concerned about this situation than males, as evidenced by the fact that the majority of writers who chose to research it were women. The women wanted to know why their presence in administration was so weak; many wished to know why their advancement was limited or constrained.
As a result, the literature of the 1970s about female higher education administrators focuses on the possible reasons for the poor representation of women, the weaker career planning skills of women, and the perceived differences of the genders in leadership positions. Moore and Wollitzer (1979) state that there were only 50 studies at the time about women in higher education administration that they were able to analyze. They conclude, "...the central issue in the research on women administrators in the 1970s is discrimination" (p. 12).

As the numbers of women in higher education administration slowly climbed – by the 1980s, women outnumbered men in bachelor’s degrees earned, were awarded at least 50 percent of the master’s degrees as well as one-third of the doctoral degrees, and represented 35 percent of the full-time executives, managers or administrators in higher education – the literature that was produced about female higher education administrators increased. Of the more than 260 works originally examined for this synthesis, approximately 50 percent were written during the 1980s. This expansion of research reflects the increasing numbers of women pursuing leadership careers in the field, the multiplying number of women who were now trained in research, and the expanding number of women who found dissatisfaction with the state of females in higher education administration. The literature of the 1980s focused more intently on the possible reasons behind the dearth of female administrators, particularly at top levels. It not only raised the level of awareness about the degree of sociological impact on women’s career advancement in higher education administration, but it also revealed the weaknesses attributable to females, such as languid career planning. Studies conducted gave testimony to the sociologically-based challenges to women seeking advancement in

Studies centered on female leadership in the 1980s began to reveal the frequency with which women administrators were becoming more “masculine” in their leadership style as they became more career-oriented (Mark, 1984; Stokes, 1984; and Lester and Chu, 1981, report from their study findings that women are incorporating masculine traits in order to succeed). Studies also addressed gender differences in leadership style; Leonard (1981) reports that women administrators give more of their time to others; Gill (1986) states that females she studied scored higher on relationship than males; Wheeler and Tack (1989) find women administrators work harder at achieving consensus; Lester and Chu (1981) report that women administrators show stronger pro-feminist attitudes than their male counterparts.
By 1998, females had earned approximately 63 percent of all doctorates in education; nearly 20 percent of college presidencies were held by women; and women had attained 46 percent of the total higher education administrative staff. The literature of the 1990s on women in higher education administration reflected this rise in female representation. Less of the literature spoke to the need for appropriate credentialing and experience, because women were already attaining them. The focus on career paths and planning began to decline, and more attention was directed to leadership characteristics. The literature reporting gender differences in leadership style still consistently connected the dissimilarities to sociological barriers and gender typing, but they did so with less apology or defensiveness. More studies reflect on female gender attributes that appear to be especially well-suited to the higher education administrative environment of the 1990s: studies speak to the tendency of women to adopt the “social conscience” of the institution (Harter, 1993; Weaver-Lariscy and others, 1991); to take more time to make more decisions collaboratively (Albino, 1992 Rigaux, 1995; Weaver-Lariscy and others, 1991; Grossman and Ross, 1991; Witmer, 1995); to advocate more for, and on behalf of, diversity (Touchton, Shavlik & Davis, 1993; Gill, 1992); to enable others to lead with them (Witmer, 1995; Edwards-Wilson, 1998; Cook, 1997; Grossman and Ross, 1991).

As the literature evolved into the 21st century, less focus on gender differences appeared, and studies began to suggest that leadership correlates more with position and culture, than with gender; Hill and Ragland (1995) discourage the use of gender categorizing, and Edwards-Wilson (1998) reports that the female presidents in her study sample adopt the leadership characteristics of the culture of the institution where they work.
There Are Weaknesses Within the Literature Collection. The diversity of the literature on women in higher education administration includes varying types of research, studies and narratives. Flaws are inherent in a number of the studies, as well as in the collective nature of the research. The apparent flaws include: small and/or limited sample bases, a preponderance of qualitative research, the lack of research on certain relevant topics, and a stronger focus on academic leadership as opposed to administrative leadership.

Small and/or limited samples, as detailed in the second chapter, are found throughout the collection of literature reviewed for this synthesis. Moore's (1983) national study of higher education administrators includes her observation that “Overall the studies have tended to concentrate on a narrow range of positions or institutions” (p. 2). The sizes of samples, the inconsistencies of methods and positions analyzed, and the composition of the samples lead to difficulty in developing conclusions about a comprehensive topic such as female leadership characteristics, or career paths of female administrators. It is unfair, for instance, to generalize about a common career path for women in higher education administration when a number of the studies specifically address the path to presidencies. One cannot safely draw any trend or data-based conclusions about the leadership styles of women administrators if the literature includes the experiences of a selected few administrators.

The significant proportion of qualitative research found throughout the nearly 30 years of literature reviewed, can also lead to biased conclusions. Some writers themselves point to the potential weaknesses in this research. In reference to the results of one of her studies, Ironside (1983) said, “While the need for valid information in any research effort is unquestioned, it should be noted that the findings were based on individual perceptions
as much as fact” (p. 6). Stokes (1986) also offers this reminder, “Although the survey process is useful, it can be flawed if the respondents have accepted or internalized cultural biases about women’s deficiencies…One’s perception of one’s own behavior or needs is not always accurate (p. 14). In 1979, Moore and Wollitzer contended:

Too much of the research we reviewed focused on traits and states, while very little has been done to analyze the structure(s) within which higher education operates. In short, full scale research on women as academic administrators remains to be done (p. 16).

Further, they state, “A greater emphasis on analytic and evaluative as opposed to descriptive research is needed” (p. 19). There is clearly a place for qualitative research within the study of women administrators in higher education, and such research is certainly valuable. However, the findings of qualitative study are not without weakness as they pertain to the presentation of conclusive findings. Stokes (1986) says of the studies of the time, “The most common assessment process is casual observation, through which the most erroneous assumptions are made” (p. 15). Weaver (1978) chose to conduct interviews of female administrators to explore questions she raised about decision-making, and she confesses that her findings can be faulty; “While some generalizations are inevitable, I cannot present them as research findings which will stand up under scrutiny” (p. 2). The qualitative studies on women in higher education administration are better presented with more empirical research by their side.

There is a surprising lack of literature on some of the subsidiary questions put forward in this synthesis. Specifically, questions related to leadership are those with less literature available than expected. While there are some studies and narratives that
present female administrators' definition of leadership in higher education administration, most related studies only infer definitions rather than seek them out conclusively. The role of personal values in the development of women's leadership styles is not explored with consistency; this may suggest, however, that personal values play no role. But studies that definitively prove this do not appear to exist, either. The view that subordinates have of female managers' leadership is also explored with little frequency. Therefore, while the previous chapter on leadership characteristics of female administrators presents findings worthy of discussion, the findings in some cases are based on very limited research. Hence, as has been stated before, the validity of the synthesis findings should be considered with caution.

The emphasis on academic leadership positions and academic career paths becomes a weakness in the literature integration, and this presents great difficulty in synthesizing the literature on women in higher education administration. As stated in Chapter I, the focus on female administrators in this synthesis was meant to be all-inclusive; it was not to be limited to a specific category of female administrators. The literature is heavily focused on academic leadership positions, however, and less inclusive of non-academic administration—even in the face of expanding administrative staffs at institutions around the country due to increasing student life and fund raising needs. Conclusions regarding common career paths for female higher education administrators, in particular, are faulty when these findings are based on career paths of female faculty seeking advanced administrative posts. The literature suggests that the paths the non-academic administrators follow (such as public relations directors, student affairs staff and enrollment officers) are different than those of faculty chairs who
progress to dean and president positions. But the literature does not explore with the same
degree of focus exactly what paths non-academic administrators take.

Indeed, it is difficult to synthesize approximately 30 years of findings because of
both the complexities of the literature and its weaknesses. Perhaps more importantly, the
potential to generalize about the status of women administrators based on any included
flawed research can have significant impact on the evolution of the literature, as well as
on the evolution of women in higher education administration.

The Literature Reveals Conflicts in Findings. The nature of scholarly inquiry supports the
notion that conflicts can arise within study findings, therefore the fact that conflicts
appear in the review of the literature on women in higher education administration is not
particularly significant. However, the role of conflicts in the integration of a collection of
literature does deserve noting.

The areas addressed in the synthesis that reveal a greater incidence of conflict are
primarily in the topic of career path. There are studies that suggest a common career path
exists for female administrators to advance (including Graham, 1974; Warner and others,
1988; and Warner and DeFleur, 1993), while other studies argue no common path exists
(such as Freeman, 1977; Moore and Sagaria, 1981; Donohue, 1981; and Evans, 1985).
There are conflicting findings regarding the role of mentors; while many studies report
the great importance of mentors for women (among them McNeer, 1983; Evans, 1985;
Barrax, 1985; Moore, Twombly and Martorana, 1985; and Hill and Ragland, 1995), some
find that mentoring is not a critical component to successful career advancement (as cited
in Merriam, Thomas and Zeph, 1987).
There are also conflicting studies regarding the male and female perceptions of the value of committee and community service. Studies by Sagaria (1985) and Wheeler and Tack (1989) argue that it is valued more by females, yet Moore (1983) and Moore, Twombly and Martorana (1985) find it to be valued more by males. While discrimination is not a topic of focus in this synthesis, it certainly is reported in some of the findings to be a key obstacle to female administrators' career advancement (such as Pfiffner, 1975; Warner and others, 1988; and Johnsrud and Heck, 1994); however, Epstein (1970) and Andruskiw and Howes (1980) find that discrimination is not always primary among those factors that inhibit a woman's career in educational administration.

The outcome of such conflicts may appear simplistic, but should be noted nonetheless. That is: a synthesis of the evolution of a common career path for female administrators, or of the role of mentors in the career advancement of female administrators, or of particular leadership characteristics commonly found in female administrators, can not be produced without mention of the conflicts, so as to protect the integrity of the integration.

The Literature is Inconsistent in Its Approach to Gender-Based Studies. The literature includes studies that examine only females' career paths and leadership characteristics in higher education administration, such as Ironside (1983) "Women as Administrators in Higher Education: Qualitative Data for Value Questions," and Twale (1992) "An Analysis of Higher Education Administrative Appointments: A Focus on Women from 1986 to 1991". It also includes research that compares female and male counterparts; among them, Barrax (1985) "A Comparative Career Profile of Female and Male University Administrators," and Moore, Twombly and Martorana (1985) "Today's
Academic Leaders: A National Study of Administrators in Community and Junior Colleges.” Questions can be raised as to the validity and/or appropriateness of these approaches, but the inconsistency of the approaches alone also impacts the integration of the literature. It is difficult to synthesize studies on decision making styles of female administrators, for instance, if some studies report how a sample of women presidents make administrative decisions, while other studies present a situation and compare how male and female presidents handle that situation. Do both studies present accurate descriptions of female presidents’ decision making styles?

There are many arguments in favor of female-only studies. Such an approach supports the contention that unless women are considered apart from men in the research, the findings will never accurately reflect a true representation of women’s style and experiences. The argument behind this is generally one of sociological import; that is, the dominance of males historically in higher education administration will contaminate the purity of a finding about issues such as women’s leadership definitions or the career planning of females. The “male norm” and the male context continually infiltrate measurements and analyses related to higher education administrators, especially when males are considered as part of the study. For instance, the male norm is heavily correlated with gender stereotyping as it pertains to leadership traits; the presumption that leaders must be strong and decisive, for instance, suggests that men are better suited to leadership roles because they are presumed to carry the traits of strength and decision making. Freisen (1983) states, “Prior to 1970, most research on leadership dealt with exclusively male populations. Thus, the strong relationship between leadership and masculine sex-role characteristics should not be surprising” (p. 228).
However, as Pearson, Shavlik and Touchton (1989) indicate, leadership studies based on male norms cannot accurately present the specific challenges and achievements of female leadership:

Even though women have made progress during the 1970s and 1980s, men still serve as the educational norm by which women are evaluated. Institutions have yet to really reflect the life experiences of women or to recognize their full humanity (p. 7).

Bensimon (1991) says, “The failure to look at women separately imposes severe limitations on the understanding of leadership if we assume that gender plays a critical role in issues of power and decision making” (p. 466). Stokes addresses potential flaws of gender-based studies as well, declaring, “...it is useless to compare women to men unless one controls for years of experience, level of responsibility, and other pertinent variables” (p. 15). Hubbard and Robinson (1994) declare, “Because of the underrepresentation of females in administrative positions, there is a need to explore and evaluate these characteristics in order to facilitate future administrative positioning of females” (p. 3).

Another argument favoring the approach of female-only samples is that such findings can help articulate the impact that the higher education organization has on female administrators. Moore and Wollitzer (1979) support this contention:

We need to understand more fully the way in which the structure of higher education affects the development of women in their various roles as students, scholars and administrators. This should include analysis of the dynamics between institutional structure and the individual woman and its effect on values, attitudes and behaviors (p. 19).
Grover (1992) offers a reminder: "The participation of women in higher education has always been marginal, because conceptions of education are and have been shaped by men's motivations and needs, whereas the conceptions of women are and have been determined by middle-class ideals of femininity" (p. 331). As she observes the increase in scholarship on women administrators, Bensimon (1991) makes yet another point regarding the infiltration of male-based norms:

It is interesting to note that men did not begin researching the topic of women administrators until 1976, well after women began the work. Research on women in educational administration, then, is done primarily by women but supervised by men (p. 7).

Those who conducted studies with female-only samples did so in an attempt to give women administrators their own voice, their own signature, in the matters of career advancement and leadership characteristics. This approach avoids the question that can arise in studies inclusive of both sexes: if a difference in leadership style is observed, is the difference considered to be negative for the females because it is a deviation from the reigning male leadership characteristics?

Those studies that include both male and female samples, however, support the notion that a complete picture of leadership and career advancement in higher education can only be presented if genders are considered and compared together. Writers of such studies suggest that identifying similarities and differences between the genders provide valuable insight into understanding women's ability to succeed in higher education administration. Gender comparisons made within an empirical context, for example, can challenge the presumptions based on gender stereotyping that there are wide differences
in leadership characteristics between male and female administrators. Mark (1981)
argues:

Future research should include comparisons of women with men at the same
levels of administration. Leadership is an important dimension of achievement.
As such, it is critical to learn if and how women and men differ in leader behavior
and the consequences of this if women are ever to achieve full parity with men in
the academic marketplace (p. 196).

Randall, Daugherty & Globetti (1995) also present an argument to conduct studies with
gender comparisons; they examine the characteristics of female student affairs officers in
their study, but point to improvement that can be made in the research: “An obvious
limitation of this research is the absence of data regarding the male chief student affairs
officers for comparison. Further study regarding the male senior administrative officer
would provide more insight into the overall challenges of the position” (p. 22). Some
studies that have drawn conclusions using a gender comparison approach include
Cimperman (1986), whose study of men and women in administrative positions finds that
there is no difference in their self-perceptions of their leadership behavior; Grossman and
Ross (1991), who find that there are differences in management styles of registrars and
admission officers based on gender; and Johnsrud and Heck (1994), who report that
gender has significant direct effects on the prior placement of an individual in a position
as well as on the status, salary, and responsibility achieved as a result of promotion.

The inconsistency in approach to gender-based studies demands that caution be
exercised in blending study results to come up with a finding, when the studies have not
been conducted similarly. For example, Reisser (1988) reports that a substantial number
of the women she surveyed had given serious consideration to resigning from their administrative posts. But Schonwetter and others (1993) evaluated job dissatisfaction rates of male and female administrators, and find that men have higher job dissatisfaction overall than women. What conclusion can one draw about female administrators’ career satisfaction based on these two studies? A conclusive finding is not possible when studies such as these are integrated.

**Female College Enrollments and Administrative Appointments Have Been Increasing, Slowly** The one topic in the literature where ambiguity or conflict does not cloud its synthesis, is on the topic of female college enrollments and female administrators. The studies that are regularly conducted to assess the current profile of women administrators are the more reliable studies (conducted annually and most thoroughly; including data collected by the American Council of Education, the U. S. Department of Education, The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and the National Research Council). These studies have consistently determined that the numbers of women in higher education administration have been increasing, and that more and more women are entering college and earning degrees. The literature also consistently supports the finding that women are found in greater numbers at the lower level administrative positions; as Fennema and Ayer (1984) state:

> Within professional ranks women are underrepresented at the higher levels. Thus, women are not in appropriate positions for administrative advancement. The positions they do occupy are low profile, carry little influence to affect change, and are often on the periphery of the power structure (p. 236).
Nearly a decade later, Warner and DeFleur (1993) report, "Women are disproportionately represented in the lower levels of administrative positions and many are in nonacademic tracks even though they have similar educational experiences as men" (p. 18). Twale (1995) finds that in the ranks of student affairs administrators, women are clustered near the lower end of the hierarchy. This trend reflects the status of women in the workplace overall, as reported by the U. S. Department of Labor. Women have increased their share considerably in the numbers of executive, administrative and managerial positions in the workforce, but still remain a small percentage of the chief executive officer ranks. Ottinger and Sikula (1993) summarize about the female CEOs in academe, "While women have more than doubled their numbers as CEO's [sic] since 1975, they still have a long way to go to reach equity."

There Are Prevailing Barriers to Advancement for Female Administrators. Barriers to female advancement in higher education administration are proposed and examined regularly in the literature. While the severity of the barriers may change, and some barriers even disappear, a set of prevailing barriers can be identified that are cited throughout the literature on women in higher education administration.

These commonly cited and long-lived barriers can be categorized as either self-imposed or sociologically based, although it can be argued that the barriers that are self-imposed find their roots in sociology as well. The primary self-imposed barriers that are found in the literature are the lack of appropriate credentials; and women's weak career planning and advancement goals. Those barriers that are sociologically based include the forced choice between family and career; the time-in-line requirement for career advancement; mentoring; gender typing; and the hiring process.
While the literature is not definitive regarding which credentials are most
desirable for advancement in higher education administration, it is rather clear that a
college degree is required; studies (such as Paul, Sweet and Brigham, 1980; and Moore,
1984) suggest that a higher degree is preferable to improve one’s chance for
advancement. By not pursuing a college degree, a female has self-imposed an obstacle to
attaining a career in administration.

The literature also points to women’s weak career planning strategies and
advancement goals, citing numbers of studies, (from Kreps in 1974 to Touchton, Shavlik
and Davis in 1993) that report that women are lacking in career strategizing. These
women are prone to not pursuing a promotion or advanced level position without being
prompted by someone else. Often, women will stay in a current position rather than leave
it, even if it is a troubling one, because of their commitment to effecting change (perhaps
described as “if it’s broken, I’m supposed to fix it, not run away from it”). Many women
cannot define their five- and ten-year career goals, and women will frequently limit these
goals due to setting their sights lower; the level of the position for which they believe
they are qualified is often a reflection of their own self-disparagement.

One barrier to career advancement imposed by society, and subject to repeated
discussion, is the choice women face between family and career. Studies (such as the
Epstein, 1970, book on the options and limits in women’s professional careers; Kreps,
1974, analysis of females in higher education; Kaplan and Helly, 1984, “Agenda for
Senior Women Administrators”; and Touchton, Shavlik, and Davis, 1993, study of
women in presidencies) point to the adjustments and sacrifices women will make in their
career progression to meet family demands. Some women do not pursue other positions
because of their limited mobility; they cannot move due to family needs. Others find that they must delay earning the degree or acquiring the job experience required for advancement because they wish to have children, or must attend to the family. This choice is frequently connected to another common barrier to advancement: the time-in-line requirement.

The time-in-line approach to career advancement carries little forgiveness for “stopping out” of a career to have children or raise them. When candidates for a position are reviewed, those who do not show evidence of continuous career progression may be eliminated in favor of the candidates who do not present any career interruptions. Clearly, men are more likely to offer an interruption-free career resume. Hence women may find the time-in-line requirement to be a barrier to their career advancement.

Mentoring (and related topics of role models and sponsorship) are addressed with relative frequency throughout the literature. There are conflicting findings regarding the impact of mentoring on a woman’s career development, but the frequency of references to mentoring demand its inclusion in this listing of barriers. As has been suggested in chapters of this synthesis, mentors can have a positive impact on a woman administrator’s opportunity for advancement. The mentor serves as a career guide, and can provide direction to the female regarding sensitive or political situations. Bower (1993) contends:

Over the last 20 years, the advice has been much more realistic but the problem of ‘making it’ in a male dominant career is still a matter of finding a fit without discarding self. Having a woman mentor who has been able to master this conflict
is an important aspect of a woman's success in a career predominantly male filled (p. 95).

Bower, as do others, points out that women have limited access to a mentoring relationship, which can have a negative impact on the woman's career advancement. Reasons for this limited access include: there are fewer women in "veteran" administrative roles available to mentor; females are not brought up with sports and other social experiences that allow them to develop relationship skills and therefore seek out a mentoring relationship; many women are opposed to serving as mentors because they are threatened by the notion that another female will ascend to the level they have attained. Males can serve as mentors to females as well, but the literature reports that men may refuse to mentor women because of the possible misinterpretation of the male-female mentoring relationship as a sexual relationship, or because the male does not perceive that the female has talent worth mentoring. This limited access to a mentoring relationship can serve as a barrier to a woman's career growth. Without a mentor, she does not benefit from the substitute of an "old boy's network," nor does she compete at an advantage for positions that other men, who have been mentored, are also pursuing.

Gender typing is a pervasive factor in female administrators' career advancement and leadership development, often becoming a barrier to success for a woman. Fennema & Ayer (1984) declare:

Sex-role stereotyping is the single most important barrier for women. It is the basis for most discrimination and lack of sponsorship and the primary reason for the slow rate of promotions resulting in a generally depressed career pattern. As
long as a viewer accepts perceptions as valid, the die is cast for a range of behaviors, practices, attitudes, and emotions (p. 226).

According to research (Dale, 1973; Reeves, 1975; Fennema, 1977; Ayer, 1984; Sandler and Hall, 1986; North, 1991; Kenny, 1991), female administrators who seek advancement in their careers can also be subject to misinterpretation of their leadership behavior because of gender typing. The adoption of more “masculine” characteristics such as assertiveness and competitiveness can cause males to view such women as threatening. Yet women administrators who avoid presenting a threat by emphasizing more “feminine” traits are also often perceived by men as weak, needy and less capable of leadership.

The literature on women in higher education administration points to another potential barrier, and like many of the above mentioned sociological-based factors, it likely plays a role in other professions as well. This barrier is the hiring process itself, a routine practice in most organizations, institutions and businesses. Hiring practices have been subjected to federal regulations that demand more inclusive policies, such as those connected with affirmative action. However, search committees do not have to be inherently sexist to pose as an obstacle to women candidates. The mere make-up of a search committee can be a barrier to a woman’s advancement possibilities. Since males still predominate the upper levels of the higher education administrative ranks, there is the likelihood that the search committees will include a large number of males. Tinsley (1985), Sagaria and Johnsrud (1992), and Johnsrud and Heck (1994) report that members of search committees seek out candidates that are like them. Males on search committees
are prone to look for the candidate who will fit in, has budgetary experience and are most like themselves. This does not bode well for the female candidate.

The literature cites all these barriers with greater frequency and documented impact. The integration of the reported outcomes of these barriers leads to a primary conclusion: opportunities become limited for women to advance in administration, producing smaller numbers of women in higher education administration. In addition, Stokes (1984) summarizes other outcomes of these prevailing barriers besides their influence on women's career aspirations: they create or distort a woman's need for certain professional skills, and they cause women to alter and experiment with their administrative style.

There is No Documented Common Female Leadership Style; There is a Commonly Cited Leadership Characteristic of Females As concluded previously, the literature on women in higher education administration presents weaknesses that preclude the pronouncement of a definitive female leadership style. The conflicts among findings, the flawed or limited studies available, and the inconsistent approaches to the gender-based research contribute to this challenge. However, the literature does present a common leadership characteristic of women with enough frequency to merit its inclusion as part of this synthesis. This characteristic is the tendency toward collaborative and participatory leadership; perhaps better simplified as consensus building. Other characteristics, such as ambition; a social conscience; and a propensity toward the humanization of the workplace, also appear in a significant number of the findings about female higher education administrators. They do not receive as much attention in the literature as does the woman's predisposition toward reaching consensus.
The tendency toward a collaborative and participatory leadership is cited in many of the findings (among them, Weaver, 1978; Ironside, 1983; and Wheeler and Tack, 1989). More significantly, this characteristic is cited in the outcomes of a variety of works: narratives, qualitative studies based on small samples as well as large samples, gender comparison studies, interviews with female college presidents, analyses of previous research, gender comparison studies on specific positions, race-specific qualitative studies, and empirical research. Although there are also a number of studies (Leonard, 1981; Ironside, 1983; Gips and others, 1984; Gill, 1984; Jones, 1985; Cimperman, 1986; Wheeler and Tack, 1989; Edwards-Wilson, 1998; Grossman and Ross, 1991) that report no significant difference exists in the leadership style of female and male administrators, those that do posit differences present this characteristic consistently, even despite the weaknesses of the literature base. As stated in the previous chapter on leadership, the regularity with which this characteristic of consensus-building seems to be exhibited by women administrators is generally attributed to sociology (women are nurturers, anxious to please, diplomatic), and to a survival tendency (achieving consensus brings more people together under the female administrator’s guidance, assuring her survival in a male-dominated workplace).

As consensus-building evolved in the literature as a commonly cited female leadership characteristic, other research began to examine the appropriateness of such a style within the higher education organization. This literature led some researchers to speculate that women were better suited for higher education administration posts, especially heading into the 21st century.
Androgyny Becomes a Significant Concept in the Literature Integration. Evolving out of the literature integration is the concept of androgyny. This is not a concept unique to higher education administration, however; it has its application in the business world and in other organizations. To be androgynous is to possess the characteristics of both sexes. An androgynous leader carries both male and female traits into their leadership style. The evolution of this concept in the literature has great significance. Its insertion suggests: a willingness to accept the existence of gender-based traits; a recognition that there are both male and female characteristics that are positive leadership traits; a question about who does more of the “blending” to become androgynous – the female or the male leader; the potential for misinterpretation of leadership characteristics in women; and offering this concept of androgyny as a potential future direction for higher education leadership.

It is important to note that the introduction of the androgynous leader concept confirms the notion that there are indeed male and female traits in the leadership field, and that some of both of them are desirable for leadership success. At the heart of what the writers report in the literature about women in higher education administration is a desire to prove or disprove that women are different from men in leadership characteristics. What often happens in these studies, for many understandable reasons, is that the writers consciously or unconsciously seek to defend the women’s leadership style, even suggesting in some cases that it is better suited to higher education leadership. There is somewhat of an “either/or” judgement in this treatment regarding males and females. But the introduction of androgyny adds a different dimension to this slightly more defensive approach to the topic. It allows the acceptance of different gender traits in
leadership and it allows the recognition that some male traits may be desirable for (female) educational leaders to possess. Lester and Chu (1981), Ayer (1984), Kenny (1991), Harter (1993), and Ausejo (1993), are very clear in their suggestions that female administrators adopt some male attributes.

Some studies (Mark, 1984; Anderson, 1993; Chliwniak, 1997) state that women emulate men's leadership styles to "make it in a man's world." Androgyne allows the women to maintain some of their "feminine" traits while adopting masculine traits. The insertion of this androgynous leader theory into the research leads to other interesting questions – which gender needs to adapt first? Which gender needs to adapt more? Lester and Chu (1981) and Mark (1984) contend that women have done most of the adapting. However, Leonard (1981), Jones (1987) and Anderson (1993) suggest that both male and female administrators have exercised some blending of traits. These questions have not been addressed thoroughly in the literature.

Adapting a more masculine approach to leadership is not without its drawbacks for women, according to some studies. Dale (1973), Nieboer (1975), Reeves (1975), Freeman (1977) and Ayer (1984) report that since masculine traits are generally believed to be inconsistent with femininity, women leaders who adopt such traits can be considered as a threats to male leaders; they also may suffer from the application of a double standard. For example, the woman who attempts to be friendly may be perceived as flirting, while the friendly male is considered to be networking.

Yet the literature also suggests that the introduction of androgyne can be the introduction of a new approach to leadership in higher education which would refocus the attention on leadership situations and not on gender of the leader. Friesen (1983) states
that “The concept of androgyny, stressing the development of a broad repertoire of behaviors, offers opportunity for men and women to engage in behaviors based on their appropriateness in a given situation” (p. 228). Leonard believes that “the University climate may in fact encourage more androgynous managers” (p. 17), while Hill and Ragland (1995) contends, “Perhaps our need for leadership is so great that the optimum time has arrived for us to use our resources to develop the best and to select the best leaders regardless of gender descriptors” (p. 49). Greater acceptance of androgynous leadership can result in fewer generalizations about leadership styles, Jones (1987) suggests. As the leadership traits continue to blend, there is less distinction made regarding specific gender traits, and any gap in leadership styles between males and females grows smaller. Andruskiw and Howes (1980) predict:

The feminine characteristics such as sensitivity, sympathy, and consideration will be incorporated into the administrative model so that it will no longer be viewed as a male model. The liberalization of the administrative model may end up freeing both men and women from the expectations resulting from organizational homogeneity (p. 492).

Recommendations for Further Study

This synthesis seeks to integrate the literature about women in higher education administration and therefore present new perspectives on this topic. Based on the synthesis’ findings, topics arise that require further research.

Regarding the profile of women in higher education administration, it is recommended that gender comparison studies be conducted to assess further the demographics of administrators. Specifically, research on the percentage of female and
male administrators who are married; research on the age of marriage and childbearing incidences; research on the rate of divorce among administrators; and research on the number of years an administrator stays in a position and stays in higher education administration, are recommended for reflection on the status of female higher education administrators in the 21st century.

Regarding the career paths and leadership characteristics of women in higher education, more position-specific studies are recommended to determine if there are gender-related differences in career choices and leadership style at other levels of administration, such as vice president, assistant director, associate dean. Also, the focus of a significant portion of the literature examined in this synthesis was on women in academic administration. It is recommended that comparison studies be conducted on women in academic administration with those in non-academic administration to examine differences and similarities among these women as they relate to career choices and leadership development.

Given the increase in numbers of female administrators over the past thirty years, extensive job satisfaction research should be conducted with significant samples of these women to better assess their status in higher education administration, particularly regarding the influence of the higher education organization and structure.

Among the areas in this synthesis that revealed a lack of literature was that of subordinate satisfaction with superiors, based on gender. That is, there were not many studies conducted that evaluate the attitudes subordinates possess about working for a female or a male higher education administrator. It is suggested that further research be applied in this area, especially as it pertains to the ages and opinions of males working for
female administrators. This will also provide a status report of women in administration as the 21st century unfolds.
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