

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Journal of Women in Educational Leadership

Educational Administration, Department of

10-2004

Journal o/Women in Educational Leadership, Vol. 2, No. 4--October 2004

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/jwel>



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#), and the [Women's Studies Commons](#)

"Journal o/Women in Educational Leadership, Vol. 2, No. 4--October 2004" (2004). *Journal of Women in Educational Leadership*. 126.
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/jwel/126>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Educational Administration, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Women in Educational Leadership by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

LAGNIAPPE

Marilyn L. Grady
Barbara Y. LaCost

Two new features are introduced in this issue of the *Journal of Women in Educational Leadership*. We welcome a feature that will be known as **Women in History**. Sandy Gaspar provides the first entry for this section of the journal. We also introduce Harriet Gould's essay in the section of the journal that will be called **Voices of Women in the Field**.

As we prepared these new features, we were reminded of the "hidden lessons of unconscious bias" that Myra and David Sadker (1994) so clearly identified in *Failing at fairness: How our schools cheat girls*. Silencing of women and the invisibility of women are enduring concerns.

The Sadkers noted that "girls grow quieter as they grow older" (p.10). The voiceless in our society are the women. For this reason, we hope that the **Voices of Women in the Field** section of the journal will give greater voice to women. Women must write of their experiences so that we may be attentive to the perspectives of those who are practicing their leadership craft on a daily basis.

In **Women in History**, we focus on the accomplishments of women so that we move beyond the conundrum of not being able to name outstanding women leaders, heroic women, or women who have influenced education.

One of the issues that we have been able to observe recently is the situation of a colleague who is nearing retirement age. This individual has had a career in education for almost 50 years. Teaching and service have been the individual's life. A consummate networker, this person has reached across the United States. However, when this individual walks away from the workplace, the legacy that is left will be the lives that have been personally touched. A great legacy indeed for a committed life, but we also recognize that the names that are remembered for generations are often the names of those who have left a trail of writing.

Those who teach and those who serve have much to share. We invite you to share the great knowledge and experiences you have---through the written word. We need the **Voices of Women in the Field** to inform us today and in the future. We need to recognize the **Women in History** who have led the way. We hope your legacy will include a written record.

Women in History

Mary Parker Follett: A Leadership Theorist Ahead of Her Time

Sandy Gaspar

As a management and leadership voice in the 1920s and 30s, Mary Parker Follett was far ahead of her time (Burnier, 2003; Business Strategy Review, 2002; Harrington, 1999; Smith, 2002). Follett was born in 1868 in Quincy, Massachusetts and was educated at Radcliffe. She began her professional life as a social worker in Roxbury, an ethnically and socio-economically diverse neighborhood outside Boston. She believed strongly in the power of diversity to enrich society and advocated the grass roots development of community-based organizations and adult education (Smith, 2002, p. 3). After 1908, she became involved in a movement to establish community centers in public schools and contributed to many community-based and governmental organizations, including the Women's Municipal League, the Massachusetts Minimum Wage Board, and the National Community Center Association.

Throughout her lifetime, she refused to accept the dualities and dichotomies that threatened to divide individuals and organizations. In her book, *The New State*, she argued that group organization and local networks were keys to the advancement of democratic societies (1918). She delineated crucial elements of her philosophy: (a) individual and groups are not antitheses, (b) there is no necessary contradiction between the citizen and the state, (c) freedom and determinism are not opposites, and (d) self and others are not opposites (Smith, 2002, p. 5). She advocated and practiced group processing techniques and, as Boom (2002) noted, she believed in the constructive use of conflict for organizational growth (p. 17). She wrote *Creative Experience* in 1924 as the result of a growing interest in industrial relations and management. Until the end of her life, she wrote, lectured, and served as a management consultant for organizations in the United States and Britain.

Her management theories were in stark contrast to Frederick Taylor's scientific management principles, which emphasized productivity and efficiency. Follett, instead, advocated shared power among management and labor, who together cooperate "to define not only productivity but situations of social justice" (Smith, 2002, p. 8). Her work, like contemporary leadership studies, stressed the importance of collaboration, shared decision-making and

About the Authors

Sandy Gaspar has been an educator for 26 years. She earned her undergraduate degree from Northern State University in South Dakota, masters degree in English Literature from Purdue University and School Administration from South Dakota State University, and is currently doing doctoral work in Educational Leadership. She taught English and writing at the high school, tribal college and university levels, and served as a school administrator for 11 years. Currently, she is employed by Technology and Innovations in Education (TIE), based in Rapid City, SD, and serves as the program director for South Dakota's Region 7 Education Service Agency.

human relations. In addition, she was among the first to describe leaders who "saw the whole rather than the particular, organized the experiences of the group, offered a vision of the future and trained followers to become leaders (Business Strategy Review, 2002).

Follett disagreed with the prevailing belief that leaders had to be "aggressive, masterful, dominating . . . these characteristics are not the qualities essential to leadership but, on the contrary . . . they often mitigate directly against leadership" (Nation's Business, 1997, p. 24). She described the kind of leader that motivated her:

The skillful leader then does not rely on personal force; he controls his group not by dominating but by expressing it. He stimulates what is best in us, he unifies and concentrates what we feel only gropingly and scatteringly, but he never gets away from the current of which he and we are both an integral part. He is a leader who gives form to the inchoate energy in every man. The person who influences me most is not he who does great deeds but he who makes me feel I can do great deeds.

Above all, Follett believed that the role of the leader was to transform group experience into power: "And that is what experience is for, to be made into power. The great leader creates as well as directs power" (Nation's Business, 1997, p. 24).

Of her writings on leadership Bennis said, "It makes you wince when you sincerely believe, as I do, that what you have written about leadership was already literally bespoken by another 40 years before your precious and 'prescient' sentences saw the light of day" (p. 24).

References

- Boje, D., & Rosile, G. (2001). Where's the power in empowerment? *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 37(1), 90-117.
- Boom, M. (2002). Mary Parker Follett and the constructive use of conflict. In S. Korheck & M. Reese (Eds.), *Women as school executives: Research and reflections on educational leadership* (pp. 16-21). Southwest Texas State University: Texas Council of Women School Executives.
- Burnier, D. (2003). Other voices/other rooms: Towards a care-centered public administration. *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 25(4), 529-544.
- Follett, M. P. (2002). The training for the new democracy. *The New State*. New York: Longman Green and Co. (Original work published 1918). Retrieved 05/29/04 from the encyclopedia of informal education archives. <http://www.infed.org/archives/e-texts/follett-training.htm>.
- A guru head of her time. (1997, May). *Nation's Business*, 85(5), 24. Retrieved 05/29/04 from <http://0-web18.epnet.com/library.unl.edu/citation>.
- Harrington, A. (1999). The big ideas. *Fortune*, 140(10), 152-155.
- Mary Parker Follett: A prophet gaining honour. (2002). *Business Strategy Review*, 13(4), 75-76.
- Smith, M. K. (2002). Mary Parker Follett. Retrieved 05/29/04 from the encyclopedia of informal education. <http://www.infed.org/thinkers/et-foll.htm>.

Chasing a Gendered Agenda: Collaboration and Team Teaching in Higher Education

Dana E. Christman
Barbara N. Martin
William W. Lockwood

The pursuit of social justice should appeal to all. In the academy, we acknowledge the concept of social justice that we must deal with the issues of legal, moral, and economic obligations of both the individual and the collective. We may even believe that gender inequity is a misdeed of the past. Surely, raised consciousness and federal laws have addressed inequities. Although academic women have been a part of the faculty at American colleges and universities for more than a hundred years, we would be mistaken to believe that social justice has been fully embraced and embodied by the academy.

Academic women earn less salary across all ranks than do men (Bentley & Blackburn, 1992; Davis, Ginorio, Hollenshead, Lazarus, Rayman, & Associates, 1996; Hensel, 1991); experience greater social isolation (Beaman-Smith & Placier, 1996; Clark & Corcoran, 1986; Johnsrud & Atwater, 1993; Johnsrud & Des Jarlais, 1994; Johnsrud & Heck, 1994; Kelly, 1993; Ramey, 1995); spend less time in research activities and more in teaching (Frohlich & Holtz-Bacha, 1994; Johnsrud & Atwater, 1993; Johnsrud & Des Jarlais, 1994; Menges & Exum, 1983); do not receive the same returns on research productivity (Burns, 1992; Clark & Corcoran, 1986; Hensel, 1991; National Science Foundation, 1994); experience more difficulties in relationships with departmental colleagues and chairs (Johnsrud & Atwater, 1993; Johnsrud & Des Jarlais, 1994; Johnsrud & Heck, 1994); and tend to feel like outsiders in their own departments (Clark & Corcoran, 1986; Hensel, 1991; Johnsrud & Atwater, 1993; Johnsrud & Heck, 1994; Kelly, 1993). Gender inequity is still present.

Problem, Purpose, and Significance of the Study

Given our knowledge of women faculty experiences in the academy, we might assume that collaboration and team teaching experiences reflect

About the Author

Dana Christman has worked in higher education for a number of years and is currently an assistant professor of Educational Leadership at New Mexico State University. She has vast experience in research, grant writing, presentation, and publication in the areas of social justice, gender issues, and educational leadership.

Barbara N. Martin has been a classroom teacher, a Director of Special Education, a building level principal, and a professor of Educational Administration. She has experience in research, presentation, and publication in the areas of cultural diversity, gender issues, rural education, and educational leadership. Dr. Martin is a professor in Educational Administration and the doctoral coordinator of the collaborative doctorate from the University of Missouri-Columbia and Southwest Missouri State University in Springfield, Missouri.

Bill Lockwood has been a guidance counselor, principal, superintendent, and an assistant professor of Educational Leadership at Northwestern Missouri State University in Maryville, Missouri. He is completing his fifth year at the university where he teaches both graduate and undergraduate courses designed to prepare teachers and administrators.

similar inequities. However, there is a dearth of literature related to women's experiences in collaborating and team teaching in mixed gender groups in higher education. Further investigation is merited.

This case study sought to characterize and give voice to women faculty working in collaboration and team teaching with male faculty in a higher education setting. The experiences of the women, as well as how they made sense of their experiences are presented. Then, cast against the framework of Feminist Phase Theory, particular attention is paid to the structure, climate, and culture of the work experience. The significance of the study is found in the multiple realities of women faculty members' experiences, and in the suggestions provided for improving the chances of success for female and male faculty to collaboratively work and teach together.

Institutional Structure, Climate, and Culture

The structure of higher education institutions contributes to the barriers women faculty face. Women's experiences do not constitute the dominant paradigm and are frequently misunderstood, devalued, and discounted. Research indicated that women and minority members experience their academic careers differently than do white males (Johnsrud & Des Jarlais, 1994). The research results suggested that a sense of isolation for females is often a reason that they leave institutions. Sandler (1992) hypothesized that the existing structure of the university is the "right" one, so there is no need for change. That this structure is based on male career patterns only is not taken into consideration.

One of the most frequently documented structural barriers that women faculty face is salary. Men's and women's academic careers are distinguished by the difference in salary that persists across all faculty ranks (American Association of University Professors, 2000; Davis et al., 1996; Johnsrud & Des Jarlais, 1994; U.S. Department of Education, 2000). Women's salaries indicate that they are disproportionately found in the lower ranks of faculty. Women are tenured at a lower rate than are men (AAUP, 2000; Davis et al., 1996). Those with tenure are disproportionately found in the ranks of associate professors, rather than full professors (AAUP, 2000; Blanke, 1999).

Women's research is consistently not valued and is discredited or trivialized (Burns, 1994). Women are often considered outsiders (Aisenberg & Harrington, 1988; Kelly, 1993) and feminist scholarship challenges basic assumptions through alternative paradigms (Kelly, 1993). Such challenges can be threatening to stakeholders of the status quo, which provides impetus to discredit women's research.

The small number of women faculty underlines, rather than undermines, the majority culture. Women find it difficult, if not impossible, to gain entry into the socializing networks necessary for advancement because the dominant males in the cultures in which they work often deny the existence of such a network (Davies-Netzley, 1998).

The climate for women in many institutions can be characterized as "chilly." Of reasons given for leaving prior to tenure in Johnsrud and Atwater's (1993) study of new faculty, institutional sex discrimination was the only issue that appeared among priorities of women faculty, with 24% of women ranking it as first, second, or third. The issue of intellectual isolation was represented by 43% of those who left and the issue of career support and personal relations with the department chair was also commonly reported. The conclusion was that "women act on this perception [barriers to advancement]; they leave" (Johnsrud & Heck, 1994).

Team-Teaching and Collaboration

There are a number of examples of collaborative efforts between teachers in K-12 settings. Yet, there seem to be far fewer examples of collaborative efforts among university faculty (Moore & Wells, 1999), due in part to the fact that “Historically, the primary focus of faculty development efforts has been on the individual faculty member and his or her ability to be productive” (McMillin & Berberet, 2002).

There are benefits and challenges associated with faculty teaming. The increased amount of time required for course-planning, teaching, and workload present certain challenges, yet benefits include “richer and more rewarding course experience[s] for both faculty and students” (Austin & Baldwin, 1991, p. 228). Bowles (1994) provided a view of the benefits of team teaching from two faculty members:

The dynamic of planning together, team teaching, troubleshooting problems together, reflecting on and assessing the program’s impact on students, and navigating the paths of institutional proposals and approvals together has become an unusual process of professional growth for both of us. (p. 15)

When faculty from different departments teach together, students experience a cross-fertilization of teaching techniques, and faculty reap enhanced and expanded knowledge bases (Austin & Baldwin, 1991). Team teaching provides for modeling and support of best practices and exposure to new research from other faculty colleagues (Austin & Baldwin, 1991). Researchers (Belenky, Clinchy, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1986; Freire, 1971; McDaniel, 1987; Quinlan, 1998) reported that faculty might best learn about teaching by working together and sharing experiences and insights with colleagues and peers. Quinlan (1998) suggested that collaborative activities, such as team teaching, may even be able to create a new culture in the academy, one in which teaching achievements are valued publicly. Shulman (1993) stated that team approaches to teaching have the possibility of making teaching “community property” (p. 7).

The challenges of team teaching and collaboration cannot be overlooked. Collaboration naturally involves skillful coordination and discussion. Collaborative courses are more time intensive than traditional courses. Extra time is needed for faculty to plan, and faculty must find mutually agreeable times to meet, despite having demanding schedules (Austin & Baldwin, 1991).

Faculty need skills for successful collaboration. Greene and Isaacs (1999) specified voluntarism, parity among participants, mutuality in goal selection, shared responsibility for participation and decision making, shared resources, and shared accountability as requirements for successful

collaboration efforts. These collaborative consultation skills work in contrast to traditional consultation skills that provide for only one person, deemed to be an expert, to have control, while others accommodate and learn (Greene & Isaacs, 1999). Acquiring collaborative skills in the academy provides for faculty professional growth and development that cannot be acquired with any other teaching methods.

In this study, the collaborative team is “a small number of people with complementary skills who are committed to a common purpose, performance goals, and approach for which they hold themselves mutually accountable (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993, p. 45). By definition, the group responsibility for the work infers mutual accountability and acceptance for both processes and outcomes.

Studies have emphasized the need to examine team *processes* [emphasis added] critically (Briggs, 1997; Hargreaves, 1991; Little, 1990). Team processes refer to (a) the interactions occurring during collaboration in formal and informal meetings and team teaching experiences, and (b) the factors contributing best to team effectiveness. To develop effectiveness, however, team members must analyze and review team processes, vigilantly monitor team actions and interactions, and make adjustments in their processes for optimum functioning. Indeed, Fleming and Monda-Amaya (2001) explained that one of the most important factors in determining a team’s effectiveness may be the process that the team follows.

Theoretical Framework—Feminist Phase Theory

Historically, our thinking has focused on the public lives of men (McIntosh, 1981, 1983). The experiences of men are often mistaken for the experiences of everyone in a culture (Andersen, 1988). Of particular concern is the notion that “theories and concepts emerging solely from a male conscience may be irrelevant for the female experience and inadequate for explaining female behavior” (Shakeshaft, 1989, p. 324).

Feminist Phase Theory (FPT), as developed by Tetreault (1985, 1987a, 1987b), is a five-phase classification model designed to evaluate the awareness levels of thought about women in academic disciplines. The goal of Feminist Phase Theory is “the eradication of all oppressive gender (and related race, class, age, affectional orientation, ability) categories of analysis and the creation of a world in which difference does not breed domination or subordination” (Warren, 1989, p. 49). “Such an analysis is a necessary and helpful precursor to setting a future research agenda as well as a guide to changed practice” (Twombly, 1991, p. 14).

FPT Phase One. The first phase, Male Dominant, “assumes that the male experience is universal, that it is representative of humanity and that it constitutes a basis for generalizing about all human beings” (Tetreault, 1985, p. 367). All categories of thought are written by men about men and the male model is accepted as the norm (Tetreault, 1987b). “What is at issue is the practice of studying male behavior and then assuming that the results are appropriate for understanding all behavior” (Shakeshaft & Nowell, 1984, p. 188).

FPT Phase Two. The Compensatory Phase, the second phase, recognizes the absence of women, although maleness is still considered the standard for humanness. In this phase, there is a search for women, but male thought is still the norm. Traditional structures are not confronted or disputed. Theories are still constructed from men studying other men, causing the majority of women to be thought of as subordinate. When women do not match the male’s paradigm of the world, it is not seen as a problem with extant theory, but a sign of their weakness (Schuster & Van Dyne, 1984; Tetreault, 1985). The few women that are noted are exceptional, outside the norm by gender, novelties among the males (Schmuck, 1987; Tetreault, 1987a).

FPT Phase Three. Efforts to include women begin in phase three, the Bifocal Phase. Here, women’s efforts to overcome under-representation are recognized; however, male experience is still seen as more appropriate. In this phase, women are no longer thought of as substandard and the differences between men and women are examined (Tetreault, 1985).

FPT Phase Four. In the fourth phase, Feminist, other factors (race, social class) as well as gender are recognized and lead to diversity. Women’s experiences begin to be used to define the human experience and are analyzed within social, cultural, historical, political and economic contexts (Tetreault, 1985, 1987a).

FPT Phase Five. A fully developed perspective that unites men’s and women’s experiences into a holistic view of human experience describes the final phase of Feminist Phase Theory—Multifocal or Relational. Femininity and masculinity are on a continuum of humanness and both can be used to define a person (Tetreault, 1985). This phase may be considered “corrective” as it provides for varying viewpoints and the transformation of knowledge (Schmuck, 1987).

Methodology

Activating the voice of participants through qualitative research (Merriam, 1998; Patton, 1990) yields multifaceted findings that guide us to participants' strengths (Nicholson, Evans, Tellier-Robinson, & Aviles, 2001). This study was concerned with participant perspective, a qualitative research design was chosen as the appropriate approach. Further, a case study methodology was selected as the study was bounded by the teams and the context in which they worked (Merriam, 1998).

Data were collected through interviews using an open-ended, semi-structured questionnaire. The interviews were audio taped and transcribed verbatim by two of the researchers. A third researcher reviewed the tapes and transcripts for accuracy. The gender of the researchers included two females and one male. The written text, together with the recording and observations taken during the discussion, aided in triangulation and interpretation of meaning. Participants kept journals during the period in which they were engaged with the collaboration and team teaching for this study. Triangulation was accomplished through reading the journals of the respondents' experiences and member checks (Erlandson, Harris, Skipper, & Allen, 1993), and audit trails (Creswell, 1994). Participants provided copies of their curriculum vitae to aid in the interpretation of the analysis.

Data from the interviews were analyzed in three stages: first by open coding, then by axial coding and, finally, selective coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Coding involved working with data, "organizing them, breaking them into manageable units, synthesizing them, looking for patterns, discovering what is important, and what is to be learned" (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). Open coding involved breaking down, examining, comparing, categorizing and conceptualizing the data. The process continued into axial coding that involved sorting and defining data into categories and themes. Selective coding involved developing the story, revisiting the categories and discovering the interrelationships among categories (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Selective coding guided both interpretation and meaning and helped to aid in explanations, conclusions, inferences and linkages, and dealing with rival explanations.

Participants and Background to the Study

Interviews in this case study were conducted with two female faculty members in medium sized, public universities in the Midwest. Both women held the Ed.D. Collectively, they had 44 years experience in education. Both had served in increasingly responsible positions in education, including administration, outside of the traditional higher education faculty roles for a combined total of 31 years. Collectively, they had served for a total of 13

years as faculty members in higher education. One participant held the rank of tenured professor and the other was a tenure-track, assistant professor.

Both participants had active research and presentation agendas. Together they had three book chapters, 18 refereed journal articles, and numerous books, web-site, and other reviews. They had also presented at numerous national, regional, and state professional conferences and were active on their campuses, having served on and chaired numerous committees. Both women had had formal leadership training and had been responsible for training others for service in leadership. Both had collaborated with others as members and leaders of past teams.

The participants were given pseudonyms of Nelda and Elisa and were chosen by purposive sampling (Patton, 1990). Both women had had recent collaboration and team teaching experiences that had lasted for the majority of a year. We gained consent to participate, guaranteed confidentiality, gained permission to use journals, to obtain copies of their curriculum vitae, as well as permission to audio-tape and to use transcripts from their interviews. Each woman was interviewed during the course of a collaboration and team teaching experience—once during the planning session phase, once immediately following the team teaching experience, and once for a follow-up interview.

Procedures

Specific data needs, sources, and analysis strategies emerged from the purposes of this study. The selected women faculty members were preparing to have team teaching and collaborative experiences in mixed gender groups during a period of time, no less than one semester. We asked the potential participants about the goals of the collaborative team (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993) and team processes (Briggs, 1997; Hargreaves, 1991; Little, 1990), so that we could determine whether the initial goals and objectives of the participants' collaborative teams aligned with our predetermined definitions of collaborative team and team teaching. After we had initially screened several women faculty who had agreed to be participants, we found that two women's experiences met the criteria for inclusion in the study. We gained consent from these women to be part of the study.

We then made certain that we would be able to secure the interviews, journals and curriculum vitae from the women. To facilitate analysis, the structure, culture, and climate of collaboration and team teaching, as well as each phase of Feminist Phase Theory, were operationally defined. Each is detailed as follows.

Structure, Culture, and Climate. Structure referred to the organization and hierarchy of the collaboration and team teaching efforts. Culture was defined as the set of patterns, beliefs, and artifacts associated with collaboration and team teaching endeavors. Climate referred to the milieu in which the women found themselves and their degree of comfort within that milieu.

Feminist Phase Theory Phases. Phase One of FPT characterized collaborative and team teaching endeavors in which women were rendered invisible. Their involvement could not be described as peripheral; they were essentially absent from discussions and conversations and had no voice. In this phase, women would have no role to play in the planning or team teaching sessions. The focus was on men and about men.

Phase Two of FPT described experiences for women when they were visible at times to the men in team teaching and collaboration. Though their involvement would be peripheral, their voices would be heard occasionally. When their voices were heard, they were thought to be the exception, rather than the rule. Women in this phase would not play active roles, but support roles, in discussions and conversations about collaboration and team teaching. Consistent with the framework of FPT, women would be considered compensatory. Their overall role would be provisional or conditional from the overall focus on their male colleagues.

Phase Three of FPT was characterized by women's visibility in the arena. They would be visible and have equity in involvement in discussions and conversations. Their roles, though different from those of the men, were still equitable. The women could impact and be impacted by certain issues, but the same could be said for their male colleagues.

Phase Four of FPT was defined by dominance of the women. Here, women would be the focus and only women's experiences would be valued. Women would be visible and men would have no voice in this feminist phase. Involvement in discussions, conversations, and team teaching issues would surround how they would impact women. Any perspectives from their male colleagues would be absent.

Phase Five, the final phase of FPT, was characterized by the absence of gender as an issue. The emphasis would be on processes and how to improve collaboration to enhance the team's processes. There would be no reference to gender in the women's experiences.

Data Presentation

Four major themes emerged: (a) alienation, (b) feeling devalued, (c) expectations for traditional roles, and (d) "chasing the hidden agenda."

Alienation. The respondents repeatedly voiced concerns that they wanted all members of the team to have a voice, but were often silenced throughout their experiences. One participant, Nelda commented, "Someone has to be willing to say, 'Let's hear everyone's voice.' In a group setting, no one should feel isolated." The other participant, Elisa, tried to carefully explain why she felt she and another woman were silenced during a team teaching experience: "I don't think either one of us wanted to seize control or was in any power play; I think we just wanted to have a voice."

Elisa went further to explain that collaborative and team teaching meetings were "hard work," that it took conscious and persistent effort to be heard. Both participants indicated that it had become a conscientious decision of how hard to work to be heard in such settings. Nelda commented that with one group with whom she had collaborated, she had to "make a great deal of effort to be heard." Elisa explained that "anytime I work with more than one male faculty member - and there aren't any female faculty members in the group - I have to really work to be heard." Nelda indicated that "I also know that I have to try that much harder to get heard, to be visible. Sometimes, it's just not worth all the effort it takes." Elisa echoed similar sentiments:

If I don't feel too passionately about something, then chances are I won't speak up too loudly or assertively. However, it does sometimes make me mad. Other times, it's just not worth the effort [of getting mad], because it's an on-going sort of thing and I've come to expect it.

Nelda added that she was "perfectly willing to speak, but had a hard time getting 'the floor.' Over time, it became less important to even try," Elisa laughed when she noted that "I've certainly learned to adapt to a certain amount of . . . well, invisibility."

Both women expressed concern for others who seemed to be alienated from groups during collaboration and team teaching. Elisa spoke about one woman with resignation, "For *two days*, she didn't talk at *all* during meetings. And she is also Asian. Talk about *silencing*!" Elisa also expressed concern about differentiating between being simply a new member of a collaborative effort and a new *female* member of a collaborative effort: "So, I don't think it's a 'new' thing, but more of a gender thing. John's situation—being new—was different. He had *no* difficulty being heard."

The women also talked about how collaborating in same sex groups was different. Nelda stated that "everyone was valued and everyone had a chance to talk. The climate was warm and nurturing." Both women stressed the need for balanced collaboration efforts. Nelda remarked that she believed "collaboration and team teaching are important aspects of a university setting and if we want to enhance that setting, then we better make sure everyone's

voice is heard.” Elisa summed up the feeling of a need for inclusiveness: “In a perfect world, each person would have a voice, no one would be silenced, there wouldn’t be undue competition for attention, and the students would benefit out of each experience, too.”

Both participants spoke repeatedly of feeling invisible and isolated during team teaching and collaborative faculty efforts. Elisa spoke of one occasion in a mixed gender group, how “whenever the other woman or I tried to get someone to tell us what the ‘plan’ was, we didn’t get an answer.” Nelda talked somewhat bitterly about one particular occasion in a similar collaborative effort and how she had diligently tried to get involved in planning efforts for teaching: “By the time we were finished, the *only* thing I knew was that I was going to do the same thing another female had done before.” Nelda continued by explaining how she felt later: “I found myself not saying much of anything for awhile. Sometimes I think we forget what collaboration should really look like, which can be sad because not everyone’s voice will be heard.” Elisa also tried to explain how she felt. “I am the one out of the loop. Do you know what I mean? Like there is a conversation going on, but regardless of what you add to it, no one really cares.” Elisa remarked that in one experience, a new male member of a team that was planning for a team teaching experience gave important suggestions to the group, suggestions that would improve the team’s effectiveness. She stated that “the other woman and I had said essentially the same thing for the last two meetings and it was like ‘whoosh,’ right past them!”

The feeling of alienation and isolation in collaborative efforts was persistent throughout the women’s responses. Nelda spoke about how she learned some of the lingo of a group only after a long time. She had been one of only two women in a group and, though she had asked for clarification several times about certain key words being used, it took a long time for her to understand what was meant. She remarked, “We learned some of the lingo at the next to last meeting. It really would have helped to understand some of those key terms they were using at the beginning!” Elisa echoed a similar experience when she described attending the first meeting of a mixed gender group who was to work together on team teaching. She wrote in her journal: “We met today as a group. No one was introduced to each other. Finally, I introduced myself to a few other people there.”

Feeling devalued. Both participants talked about feelings of being less valued or even devalued in mixed gender faculty groups that met for collaboration and team teaching efforts. Elisa commented on the irony of team teaching without a team: “We were to decide as a team. There was no *team* to it. It was like one or two of the guys would decide for everybody

else.” She went further to remark on the team concept and evidently felt that, though male members of the group were aware that planning and tasks were supposed to be a collaborative effort, they chose to overlook it. “They had to *know* it would be like this. You can’t just assign a person to a topic at practically the last moment and expect people to team teach!” Elisa later became somewhat angry, stating, “They [the male faculty members] talk to us like we *know*. *Why* should we know? *How* could we know? No one had bothered to explain the whole concept!”

Nelda also reported that planning and assignment of tasks had become the domain of the male faculty members. She wrote in her journal:

By the end of the meeting, I did not know any more of what was expected of me than before. I did observe that neither the other woman nor I were ever asked for input regarding the design of any lesson. It was a long meeting that seems wasted.

She later commented that she viewed “that experience as [one in which] the ‘guys’ really didn’t know what to do with me.” Nelda also noted the effect another female faculty member had when she tried to become part of planning and decision-making:

She told about all the things she did with research and methods. It was very apparent that that was *not* the turf she should be on. Kind of like [using a sarcastic voice], “Right, that sounds good; now, let’s go back to what *we* planned.”

Both women also discussed feeling as if the male members of the teams did not value them. They believed that what they had to add or say during discussions was not perceived as being worthy, although the women clearly felt that this was not the case. They were confused about the lack of attention paid to matters that would affect the group as a whole. Elisa commented: “All this wasted time has gone by and we were *assigned* how much time we would be spending on our topics and all that. Where’s the *team*?” She explained further about the experience: “It was intense and we [the other woman and I] were treated like stepchildren or distant, country family members who just didn’t know how to act in the city.” Nelda remarked that once another female faculty member had come to a planning meeting with an enormous amount of materials and articles to substantiate her point. Nelda commented that the males in the group never brought additional materials, since they seemed to have no problem in having their viewpoints heard. Instead, she said, this woman had to “force the guys to listen to her.”

Looking for the hidden agenda. Both Nelda and Elisa discussed spending time trying to figure out what was really happening. They had difficulty, at least initially, in believing that the men in the mixed gender groups of which they were part were not valuing them as colleagues. Both women felt that they could expect collegiality and they certainly had evidenced competence to be part of such teams. Yet, they discovered that, for the most part, they were not brought into the “inner circle.” Elisa commented that she felt, at times, like the men in her group were speaking another language and, about the time that she began to attain some sense of fluency, they changed the language again.

Elisa talked about returning to her regular routine following the team teaching experience. She claimed,

I tried to explain to [a male professor] what had happened. As I related some of the experiences, I decided to tell [him] about an incident, which I thought was particularly critical to understanding the experience from my point of view. [He had] no reaction whatsoever. It was like, “Well? And your point is. . . ?” [It was] disappointing.

Elisa was especially disillusioned that a male colleague whom she felt certain could understand her point of view seemed to miss the importance entirely. She later sighed and said, “Anyway, I am certain that the men in our group really didn’t see it. Not like we [women] did.”

Elisa went further to say,

I would also think that they [male members of the team] for the most part, felt very “progressive” about the whole thing, but I would hazard a guess that most of them don’t even give the gender differences a first, much less second, thought. I just don’t think it ever occurs to them. If it did, they would probably feel compelled to change.

Nelda concurred. She stated that she “would be very surprised if they [male colleagues] knew there were those of us who felt devalued or that we had to really work to be heard.” She went further to state, “I don’t sense that most male faculty with whom I team teach even think about equity or balance when we team teach. Not all males I have taught with, but most. Yeah, most.” Elisa added, “Most male colleagues seem unaware that a problem might exist with the way most female faculty members are treated in such settings.”

Nelda talked about differences in groups that were all female or had more females than males. She commented, “I feel like there’s a conscientious effort to be inclusive when there are more women than men in a group like

that. I don't think it's reciprocated, though. At least, not in the groups I'm in when the males outnumber the females."

Both women talked about a seeming need to keep students from "finding out" what was really going on behind the scenes. Elisa surmised,

I think students don't know anything about what is really happening. We put on our professional faces and go into the arena. We don't intend for them to know. I think we try to protect them from the "truth" about us. I don't think I want them to know how backward we can sometimes be. Maybe it's the idea of not airing dirty laundry. I want the students to benefit.

Nelda agreed, stating,

What was interesting is that we were actually supposed to be modeling behavior that we were teaching our students, so it was all sort of surreal. Here it wasn't working for us, yet we were telling the students how it would. I mean, the other woman even did a session or two on these very issues. It's almost like we didn't hear what we were preaching. Not almost. I don't think we did.

Elisa also discussed actual team teaching experiences with a male colleague and how they were often unbalanced with regard to time. She explained that initially she did not believe she was getting far less time, but commented, "When I actually looked at the situation and checked the clock a few times, I wasn't wrong. And when we would meet afterward, [the male faculty member] would inevitably say, 'Well, I thought that went well, don't you?'" Elisa felt that her experiences were not atypical for other female faculty members in such situations: "I suspect that the same sort of thing goes on in their classrooms, especially when they are the only instructor there. I would bet that if you talked to their female students, some would feel the same way [I did]." Nelda added,

I think the guys felt that the experience went well and if they knew how I really saw things, they would be surprised. . . . All in all, the guys were in charge and in the end, we all got a teaching award, so they were happy.

Both women emphasized that these experiences were likely not the intended outcomes on the part of their male colleagues. Instead, they seemed to feel that the men were unaware that they might be excluding others while in mixed gender settings. But, Elisa felt that her "'job' is not to teach some of my male colleagues how unfair they are, but I *can* let them know when they are not valuing the opinions of their female colleagues." She cited one

occasion when she and another instructor decided to share a problem with the group:

We had some genuine concerns that came from female students that we decided *must* be shared for the good of the group. When we explained our concerns, one of the men who usually took charge actually rolled his eyes while we were explaining. I 'called him on it,' and he backpedaled fairly quickly.

She stated,

Well, I would like to stress that I don't like it when people complain and aren't willing to do anything about it. So, I guess you would say that I should help own the problem, because I *am* concerned about the students.

Nelda concurred when she stated,

I admire people who do stand up for what they feel is an injustice and try to correct the situation. I had a female colleague who was such an individual and I really enjoyed working with her because of that strength.

Despite their concerns about trying to figure out where they stood with their male colleagues, these two faculty women still had moments of hope and confidence. Elisa stated emphatically, "I do believe in the 'team' concept, that two heads—or more—are better than one." Nelda confided,

I *know* I have experienced success in using formal structures in group settings that can enhance the input and probably the value of each team member. But, to do these things takes time and planning and generally can't be done from the seat of your pants.

She also said that as she participated more in team teaching experiences with male colleagues, she was finding that she "might even be getting stronger in expressing what I think and how to do things." Both women mentioned that female students came to them for help or advice more often than they seemed to come to the males.

I can tell you that several of them [female students] said they valued both me and the other female professor because we presented a different way of looking at things and that they felt valued by us. Guess we all need to feel wanted and needed.

Indeed, the women made it quite clear that their self-esteem was rarely enhanced by team teaching and collaboration experiences with their male colleagues. Nelda said that the feeling of

. . . isolation or not being valued did take its toll. Sometimes I doubted myself. If it wasn't for [another female instructor], I would really have disliked the experience. But, often we would talk and I would feel better about whatever had happened. It just seemed that I was on the "B" team and they [male faculty members] were on the varsity.

She admitted that at one point, she had "cried on the way home," thinking, "Can I really do this?" She later explained that she sought input from another female faculty colleague: "It was her input that I sought out as far as my performance and contributions and it's what gave me some feeling of success." Nelda said that one experience "was so intensive in such a short time, it really stuck with me. It took me about two weeks to get my 'confidence' back again after that."

Traditional role expectations. A theme of traditional role expectations also emerged from the analysis. Since there are traditionally two types of role expectations, female and male, these themes will be discussed separately and then, in later analysis, together. We would be remiss, however, if we did not note that traditional roles attributed to male faculty members are attributed in such a way by female faculty members.

In support of traditional role expectations for women, Nelda stated that in a collaboration and team teaching experience,

I was assigned a clerical job to do evaluations. This meant that I created, handed out, collected and tallied the evaluations and all the comments. Very clerical, no teaching involved. Guess they assumed that clerical work is a task that a female is good at. I think this is definitely a job to be assigned to a graduate student or a secretary. Makes me wonder if they even think I can teach?

She was frustrated with herself for accepting a clerical role when all others would be taking on teaching roles. Elisa had also seen the same thing occur in one of her planning sessions for team teaching: "The other woman in that group got 'assigned' the clerical duties for the group, although she *clearly* didn't want to do it." Elisa went further to explain that

That was the culture of it. We [female faculty members] were all supposed to play certain, supporting roles and somehow feel empowered from it. It was like there was this expectation that the women faculty would 'fill in' where they were needed.

Elisa also commented that male colleagues were likely not "socialized to consider it [attributing certain roles to women]. But, women are."

Elisa also believed that acting outside traditional female roles was difficult for male colleagues to handle. Although she did not view her actions as traditional or non-traditional for the most part, she did say, "If we 'shoot from the hip' like some male colleagues I know, we get looked at like we have suddenly grown another head." She spoke of one time when she and another woman had spoken very directly, very assertively, about a problem to their male team members. Talking about one male colleague in particular, she stated,

He didn't *want* to hear what we had to say. I'm sure, to him, we were acting out of character, since most of the time we were fairly quiet, *like* we had much choice. When we attempted to make him see what was surely obvious, he seemed peeved.

Nelda also indicated her discomfort with being placed in an out-of-date role for a woman: "I can remember one time that I questioned something that a guy had done. You could have broken the silence in the room with an ice pick. Then, they just went on like it hadn't happened."

Elisa indicated that women might be more hesitant to seize control, which she said helped to explain why women wanted everyone in each group to have a voice. She talked about a time when another woman in one of her groups hardly ever spoke: "I don't think she feels like she *could* speak up legitimately there." Instead, she said that the woman told her, "I'll generally go with the flow. It's not the sort of thing that will change overnight. Or even quickly."

Elisa indicated that she was not happy to be perceived as less capable than her male colleagues were in collaborative and team teaching efforts. She said, "I mean, I have supervised quite a few people at a time, so I certainly don't shrink from leadership positions. In academe, though, it seems a bit different. It's like we're a little bit behind the times." Nelda added, "My 'take' is that they [male faculty members] comply with the department's wish that team teaching should happen and that they do it and continue to do it, just the same as they always did when they worked by themselves."

In talking about the men in these groups, however, the women seemed to almost accept that the men would take on traditional roles, sometimes even blaming themselves for the dominance the men would demonstrate. For example, Nelda expressed concern about one male colleague who seemed to intimidate students: "Doesn't he know that an unpleasant learning environment could attach negative feelings to the content? I am all for high expectations, but not at the expense of losing some students' dignity." When Elisa referred to a situation where male colleagues had become disagreeable during a planning session, she stated, "But it seems like this is where some sort of turf war starts. In many ways, I think I am a little naïve about the

whole thing. . . . Then again, maybe not, we had some strong personalities and egos present at the table.”

Nelda concurred about the strong “personalities:”

I almost would say that there was some competition among the males in this team teaching—almost an unconscious thing, with one or two of the males in such settings. And not only were they competitive, they seemed to want to win. Like to have the best evaluation score or have the most students recognize them.

Elisa described a time when a male colleague “simply took control of the event. It didn’t matter that he wasn’t prepared—and most of the time, he’s not. It’s just that he needs to be seen as in charge.” She later laughed when she said: “So, *why* am I continually surprised when it comes to team teaching and whatever we have planned to present somehow turns up with the guy having done about 80-90% of the talking?”

Nelda explained how she felt about attribution of expertise in mixed gender groups:

Now, regarding certain issues, in my group we had sort of informal roles assigned as to expertise and we have a guy who, for some reason I can’t understand, is regarded as “the man” when it comes to [a certain subject], so there is not any input on that issue. I just don’t know if this guy is truly valued for his knowledge and expertise or just because he is “one of the guys.”

Elisa worked at achieving some balance in team teaching settings: “I think I try very hard to make sure there’s some sort of balance between a male faculty member and me when we team teach, but I don’t think it’s reciprocated. Not most of the time.” She later went on to talk about trying to discuss how a team teaching experience went with another male colleague, “But generally, from what I’ve seen, my male colleagues generally end up pretty much in charge of things, so how could they *not* feel fairly good about them?”

Nelda agreed:

I would say that the guys value collaboration as long as what they believe in does not get changed too much in the process and if they don’t have to do too much of the work. The guys like closure, so *any* process that ends up in a decision, they tend to like. When they are in control of the meeting, they seem to be happy.

Discussion

In this case study, it would appear that these women faculty were still suffering from “a *climate of unexpectation* [emphasis original]” (Eisenmann, 1995) regarding the use of their talents and training and how these were valued by their male counterparts. The women spoke of feeling alienated and silenced in collaborative settings. We are reminded of Greene and Isaacs’ (1999) approach to task skills necessary for successful collaboration: voluntarism, parity among participants, mutuality in goal selection, shared responsibility for participation and decision making, shared resources, and shared accountability. Greene and Isaacs (1999) reminded us that these skills work in direct contrast to traditional consultation skills. These traditional consultation skills are the skills that were observed in the analysis. We discovered that the women’s male colleagues repeatedly took control of the session, while the women were expected to accommodate and learn. Greene and Isaacs (1999) proposed that members of the collaborative team must be open to change and open to being changed. Readily apparent from the women’s stories, members of the teams in this study were neither open to change nor to being changed.

Johnsrud and Des Jarlais (1994) explained that women often feel isolated in the academy and Sandler (1992) said that the original structure of the academy was based on male career patterns and ways of work. These women, then, experienced what was to be expected. Both Nelda and Elisa, while eager to be active contributors to the team’s work, had difficulty being heard and gaining visibility to be able to contribute to the group’s efforts. They were, according to Aisenberg and Harrington (1988) and Kelly (1993) outsiders in the arena in which they were working.

The women also voiced concerns that they were the last to understand what was going on, that they had to search hard to find out the direction in which the faculty team was headed. Both Nelda and Elisa characterized their collaboration and team teaching experiences in mixed gender groups as hard work. They were often assigned tasks or roles to play. Elisa and Nelda also voiced concern that they were delegated work, usually detailed clerical work, that the male faculty did not wish to do. Whenever they attempted to act outside of some tacitly assumed traditional role for women, they were either ignored or rebuffed. Both described occasions when the climate became “chilly” (Johnsrud & Atwater, 1993). Perhaps, they experienced what Davies-Netzley (1998) suggested, that their presence in small numbers served to underline rather than undermine the majority, or male, culture. Also, because their male colleagues were unaware that they were helping to perpetuate a climate that was not conducive to collaboration, then the men saw no reason to change.

These women did not seem to be able to take the lead, although they felt competent and voiced their willingness to do so. It was difficult for the women to gain entry into the inner circle. They did not seem to possess the socializing network necessary for advancement (Davies-Netzley, 1998) because they were still outsiders (Aisenberg & Harrington, 1988; Kelly, 1993). The men with whom they worked had no reason to believe that such a structure was not the correct one, so they did not perceive any need to alter it (Sandler, 1992).

Analysis Using Feminist Phase Theory

The phases of Feminist Phase Theory were operationally defined prior to the study and data and categorical themes were cast against the framework for further analysis.

Structure. With regard to the structure of collaboration and team teaching, the phase most aptly describing the women's experiences was Phase Two, Compensatory. In this phase, maleness is considered the standard for humanness. There is a search for women, but male thought is still the norm. We recall how the women struggled to be heard. They tried to attain some sense of shared responsibility for leadership, but they were not able to do so. For example, one of the women stated: "I guess I would say that the structure, whether it's one male and one female faculty member, or whether it's an equal balance of males and females, tends to favor the males." Thus, we must discard the notion of the women's experiences reflecting Phases Three through Five.

At times the women's experiences reflected Phase One of the framework, Male Dominant. In this phase, the male experience is seen as the experience of all people. From this phase, one could make generalities about all human beings (Tetreault, 1985). The male model is accepted as the norm (Tetreault, 1987b). They spoke of being nearly invisible. One woman claimed that she had become somewhat used to the concept of being invisible. The women, though, were not complacent with their assigned "place" within the structure, thus, we rejected the notion that Phase One best described their experiences with regard to structure of the collaboration and team teaching.

Culture. Phase Two of Feminist Phase Theory, Compensatory, best depicted the women's experiences with culture. In looking across culture in collaboration and team teaching, the women's experiences were generally discounted or devalued. One of the women said that the culture was not one in which "it was intended for women faculty to have equity." The culture, as

described by both women, was one in which they were supposed to fit into certain pre-set roles, though both women acknowledged being uncomfortable with such roles.

They clearly did not have experiences which could be cast as Phase Three, whereby the differences between the experiences of male and female faculty members would have been examined. Their efforts to overcome their under-representedness were neither recognized nor accepted. Thus, Phases Four and Five were not possibilities for describing their experiences, either. Elisa commented about team teaching planning sessions:

Well, about the culture in that team teaching setting, it seemed that the culture was already established and the other woman and I would just fill in where we could. I don't think the culture was one that was collaborative in the sense of equity regarding teaching assignments.

With regard to culture, we could not escape the notion that some of their experiences may have connoted—at times—Phase One of the framework. Nelda once remarked,

In my department, the culture is definitely the "good boy." It's a culture that has changed very little over the past years, in spite of the fact that there are women on faculty now. I would say we women have learned that in order to survive this environment, we must take on the characteristics of the dominant culture. Which for me in my experience, has been male.

Climate. Phase Two also describes the experiences of the women with regard to the climate they found in collaboration and team teaching. In their experiences, the women referred to the climate at times as oppressive. Though their presence was noted, there was no attempt to bring them into the team as anything other than accessories. They often became frustrated through trying to become viable members of the team, which was clearly voiced throughout their experiences. Nelda referred back to one occasion when she felt nearly sick during a team teaching planning session:

I can remember back to that faculty team teaching meeting when I asked a question and there was *total* silence. I felt the chill go over me. In fact, even as I tell you the story, I feel something in the pit of my stomach.

The women also said that their male colleagues perceived that the climate of the collaboration and team teaching experiences was acceptable. They suggested that they and their male counterparts conceived of the climate in two divergent ways. The women acknowledged that each person has his or her own *Weltanschauung*, but they said that if their male

colleagues knew that women perceived the climate as oppressive and chilly, then they would have to look to themselves to change. The women said that they had provided sufficient, if not an abundance, of accommodation and support and were willing to accept only more, rather than less, opportunities for equity and leadership.

Ultimately, their experiences could not be designated as being associated with Phases Three through Five, since they were neither equal partners in the endeavors of the groups, nor were they ever sufficiently empowered to the point where they could act exclusively of their male colleagues. Since gender seemed to always be an issue for these women, then Phase Five also had to be discarded as a descriptor of their experiences.

Implications and Conclusions

The good news from this study is that there is plenty of room for improvement between male and female colleagues with regard to their collaboration and team teaching in higher education. The structure, culture, and climate of the academy *can* alter to improve women's chances for success. We can view the under-representedness of women as a problem and the academy can honestly attempt to understand women's experiences. Benign neglect is not an acceptable manner in which to treat women's potential and productivity.

However, the lack of movement towards the remaining phases of the Feminist Phase Theory framework, that denote gender awareness, has perplexing implications and realities for women's experiences. Academic women continue to be judged by a dominant, inner circle of men who limit women's inclusion. We must look at who the gatekeepers are and the power that they wield. Both men and women must ensure that their female colleagues' voices are not silenced and that female faculty members are not co-opted by their experiences in the academy. Women faculty members contribute unique perspectives and knowledge (Belenky et al., 1986) which provide a more holistic view to the human experience. Students need to see pedagogical practice as one that is balanced by the contributions and voices of both female and male faculty members.

Male faculty members' voices and experiences as well as female faculty voices and experiences in mixed gender collaboration efforts and team teaching should be analyzed, compared and contrasted. More research on the academy as a source of gender inequity should be initiated, too. By denying women faculty equal access to career development and advancement, colleges and universities must view themselves as bastions of injustice, rather than leaders of the future. They must change the emphasis from telling women how to change to fit into the institutional structure and culture to

finding ways to change the institutions to make them more hospitable to women. To effect change, however, the changes will need support from both men and women and from both faculty and administrators. We should remind ourselves that whatever discrimination exists in higher education is likely to be mirrored and expressed subtly and indirectly, inside and outside of the academy.

References

- Aisenberg, N., & Harrington, M. (1988). *Women in academe: Outsiders in the sacred grove*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
- American Association of University Professors [AAUP]. (2000). *The annual report on the economic status of the profession, 1999-2000: More good news, so why the blues?* Available <http://www.aaup.org/zsynop00.htm>.
- Andersen, M. L. (1988). Changing the curriculum in higher education. In E. Minnich, J. O'Barr & R. Rosenfeld (Eds.), *Reconstructing the academy: Women's education and women's studies* (pp. 36-68). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Austin, A. E., & Baldwin, R. G. (1991). Faculty collaboration: Enhancing the quality of scholarship and teaching. *ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report, 7*. Washington, DC: George Washington University.
- Beaman-Smith, K., & Placier, M. (1996). *The interplay of gender in the careers of white female and male senior professors*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, October 30-November 2, Memphis, TN. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED404896)
- Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bentley, R. J., & Blackburn, R. T. (1992). Two decades of gains for female faculty? *Teacher College Record, 93*(4), 697-709.
- Blanke, D. J. (1999). *Faculty tiering and academic inbreeding: A national investigation*. Unpublished dissertation. Ann Arbor, MI: University Microfilms Inc.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1998). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bowles, P. D. (1994). *The collaboration of two professors from two disparate disciplines: What it has taught us* (Report No. C5215050). San Diego, CA: National Reading Conference. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED386744).
- Briggs, M. H. (1997). *Building early intervention teams: Working together for children and families*. Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen.
- Burns, M. (1994). It's time to end random 'politically correct' accusations! *Thought and Action: The NEA Higher Education Journal, 10*(1), 31-55.
- Clark, S. M., & Corcoran, M. (1997). Perspectives on the professional socialization of women faculty: A case of accumulative disadvantage? *Journal of Higher Education, 57*(1), 20-43.
- Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Davies-Netzley, S. A. (1998). Women above the glass ceiling: Perceptions on corporate mobility and strategies for success. *Gender and Society, 12*(3), 339-355.
- Davis, C., Ginorio, A. B., Hollenshead, C., Lazarus, B. B., Rayman, P. M., & Associates. (1996). *The equity equation: Fostering the advancement of women in the sciences, mathematics, and engineering*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Eisenmann, L. (1995). Weathering "a climate of unexpectation." *Academe, 81*(4), 21-25.
- Erlandson, D. A., Harris, E. L., Skipper, B. L., & Allen, S. D. (1993). *Doing naturalistic inquiry: A guide to methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Fleming, J. L., & Monda-Amaya, L. E. (2001). Process variables critical for team effectiveness. *Remedial & Special Education, 22*(3), 158-172.
- Freire, P. (1971). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seaview.

- Frohlich, R., & Holtz-Bacha, C. (1994). *From preponderance to underrepresentation: Female faculty in journalism and mass communication in Germany*. Paper presented to the conference of the International Association of Mass Communication Research in Seoul, Korea, July. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED377538).
- Green, M. S., & Isaacs, M. L. (1999). The responsibility of modeling collaboration in the university education classroom. *Action in Teacher Education*, 20(1), 98-106.
- Hargreaves, A. (1991). Contrived collegiality: The micropolitics of a teachers' collaboration. In J. Blase (Ed.), *The politics of life in schools: Power, conflict, and cooperation* (pp. 46-72). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hensel, N. (1991). Realizing gender equality in higher education: The need to integrate work/family issues. 1991 ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Reports, 2.
- Johnsrud, L. K., & Atwater, C. D. (1993). Scaffolding the ivory tower: Building supports for new faculty to the academy. *CUPA Journal*, 44(1), 1-14.
- Johnsrud, L. K., & Des Jarlais, C. D. (1994). Barriers to tenure for women and minorities. *The Review of Higher Education*, 17(4), 335-353.
- Johnsrud, L. K., & Heck, R. H. (1994). A university's faculty: Identifying who will leave and who will stay. *Journal of Higher Education Management*, 10(1), 71-84.
- Katzenbach, J. R., & Smith, D. K. (1993). *The wisdom of teams*. Boston: Harper Business.
- Kelly, J. W. (1993). *Women in academe: Historical and sociological perspectives*. Paper presented as part of the "Women in Higher Education: Progress and Prospects Panel" at the Eastern Communication Association Annual Convention, New Haven, CT, May 1, 1993. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED370509)
- Little, J. W. (1990). The persistence of privacy: Autonomy and initiative in teachers' professional relations. *Teachers College Record*, 91, 509-536.
- McDaniel, E. A. (1987). Faculty collaboration for better teaching: Adult learning principles applied to teaching improvement. In J. Kurfiss (Ed.), *To improve the academy: Resources for student, faculty, and institutional development*. Stillwater, OK: New Forums Press.
- McIntosh, P. (1981). The study of women: Implications for reconstructing the liberal arts disciplines. *Forum: The Forum for Liberal Education*, 4(1), 1-3.
- McIntosh, P. (1983). *Interactive phases of curricular re-vision: A feminist perspective*. New York: Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED244895)
- McMillin, L. A., & Berberet, J. (2002). Professional development across the faculty career: An engine for implementing a new faculty-institutional compact. In L. A. McMillin & J. Berberet (Eds.), *A new academic compact: Revisioning the relationship between faculty and their institutions*. Bolton, MA: Anker. Retrieved January 29, 2002, from <http://sll.stanford.edu>. Available <http://sll.stanford.edu/projects/tomprof/newtomprof/postings.html>.
- Menges, R. J., & Exum, W. H. (1983). Barriers for women and minority faculty. *Journal of Higher Education*, 54(2), 123-144.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Moore, S. B., & Wells, R. L. (1999). Interdepartmental collaboration in teacher education. *Intervention in School & Clinic*, 34(4), 228-232.
- National Science Foundation. (1994). *The visiting professorships for women program: Lowering the hurdles for women in science and engineering: NSF summary and comments*. Study prepared for the National Science Foundation, April 1994. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED385433)
- Nicholson, K., Evans, J. F., Tellier-Robinson, D., & Aviles, L. (2001). Allowing the voices of parents to help shape teaching and learning. *The Educational Forum*, 65(2), Indianapolis, IN: Kappa Delta Pi.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation methods* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Quinlan, K. M. (1998). Promoting faculty learning about collaborative teaching. *College Teaching*, 46(2), 43-47.
- Ramey, F. H. (1995). Obstacles faced by African American administrators in higher education: How they cope. *The Western Journal of Black Studies*, 19(2), 113-119.
- Sandler, B. R. (1992). *Success and survival strategies for women faculty members*. Paper written for the Association of American Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED350906)
- Schmuck, P. A. (1987). *Gender: A relative concept for educational leadership*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED286254)

- Schulman, L. S. (1993). Teaching as community property: Putting an end to pedagogical solitude. *Change*, 25(6), 6-7.
- Schuster M., & Van Dyne, S. (1984). Placing women in the liberal arts: Stages of curriculum transformation. *Harvard Educational Review*, 54(4), 413-428.
- Shakeshaft, C. (1989). The gender gap in research in educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 25(4), 324-337.
- Shakeshaft, C., & Nowell, I. (1984). Research on theories, concepts and models of organizational behavior: The influence of gender. *Issues in Education*, 2(3), 186-203.
- Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Tetreault, M. K. (1985). Feminist phase theory: An experience-derived evaluation model. *Journal of Higher Education*, 56(4), 363-384.
- Tetreault, M. K. (1987a). Rethinking women, gender and the social studies. *Social Education*, 51, 170-178.
- Tetreault, M. K. (1987b). The journey from male-defined to gender-balanced education. *Theory into Practice*, 25, 227-34.
- Twombly, S. B. (1991). New directions for studying women in higher education: Lessons from feminist phase theory. *Initiatives*, 54(1), 9-17.
- U.S. Department of Education. (2000). National Center for Education Statistics. [1993 National study of postsecondary faculty (NSOPF:93)] *Salary, promotion, and tenure status of minority and women faculty in U.S. colleges and universities*, NCES 2000-173, by M. T. Nettles, L. W. Perna, & E. M. Bradburn. Project Officer: L. J. Zimble. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- Warren, K. (1989). Rewriting the future: The feminist challenge to the malestream curriculum. *Feminist Teacher*, 4(2/3), 46-52.

Seeking Coherence and Integrity: Personal and Professional Demands and Expectations of Senior Women Professors

Florence A. Hamrick
Mimi Benjamin

This study of 26 senior women professors at a large research university suggests that, while their negotiation of professional and personal commitments involved calculated balancing acts and strategies, they primarily described searches for integrity and coherence in life. More effective personal management strategies, modified and more realistic expectations, and a refusal to dwell on past decisions were among the themes identified. Respondents described an almost uniform and longstanding self-sufficiency and acknowledged having more control over aspects of their work, lives, and time. However, for many, time was also increasingly spent on some level of attention to health, and retirement preparation.

Introduction

In studies of the career development or work lives of professional women, attention is often focused on the tensions between goals, demands and expectations associated with their professional and personal lives. As women have entered the workforce, beginning and maintaining professional careers, they have also continued to bear disproportionate responsibility for parenting, relationship accommodation and maintenance, and household management. Decisions regarding the cumulative nature of these roles and responsibilities have often been interpreted as choices made by professional women (and their partners or other family members). The availability and quality of structural and institutional resources that could partially offset the total work load—for example, child care services—have also come under increased scrutiny, with resulting conclusions that child care is often scarce, expensive, inflexible, and/or deemed unfeasible by working parents. The study of life tensions between and within personal and professional

About the Authors

Florence A. Hamrick is an associate professor in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Iowa State University. Her research interests center on women in higher education, professional ethics, predisposition to college, and the experiences of non-dominant and traditionally underrepresented groups in higher education.

Mimi Benjamin is a coordinator for Academic Services in the Department of Residence at Iowa State University. Her research interests include learning community programs, peer mentors, professional ethics, and residence life staff roles.

expectations and goals are particularly relevant among academic women. The years devoted to graduate study and subsequent establishment of an academic career often coincide with emphases on intimate partnership formation, middle to late childbearing years, and career establishment or advancement of partners.

Although it is certainly important to focus on the early career stages of how academic women construct and deal with professional and personal tensions, less is known about the kinds of personal and professional tensions involved in latter career stages for academic women. This study is a phenomenological exploration of how aspects of intertwined personal and professional lives are experienced among a group of 26 senior women professors at a large research university. This study is designed to explore and interpret the primary personal and professional issues for academic women at latter stages of their academic careers and work lives—after critical career markers such as tenure and promotion to professor status have been achieved. Since the issues involved are often ones of career development, adult development, and aspects of faculty membership and academic work, the following review focuses on these literature bases as contexts for this study.

Literature Review

Developmental models in general, and career development models in particular, have historically been based on studies of male experiences and male perspectives on worklives and careers (Gallos, 1989; Gilligan, 1993; Sharf, 2001). However, as Gallos (1989) stated, “Developmentally, women

are different from men. The claim has surfaced so often; it can no longer be denied. . . . Women construct their conceptions of themselves, their lives, and the world around them differently from men" (p. 110). Specific research on faculty career development is much the same. The research that exists is based mostly on studies of male professors (e.g., Baldwin & Blackburn, 1981; Gallos, 1989; Mathis, 1979). Gallos (1989) concluded that these theories "do women an injustice" (p. 124). Thus, the experience of women has been potentially devalued by virtue of its absence from developmental studies and career development models.

Some studies of faculty members suggest a developmental process that is both age-related as well as stage-related. For example, two studies of male professors indicated that full professors more than five years away from retirement and full professors within five years of retirement were likely to have some common characteristics such as decreased time on and enthusiasm for teaching and research and additional attention to professional activities and department and outside service (Baldwin, 1979; Baldwin & Blackburn, 1981). For those more than five years from retirement, however, reassessing their careers and considering career change occurred (Baldwin & Blackburn, 1981).

Specific developmental information and proposed models about female academics are limited. A study of women faculty members in schools of social work suggested that those embarking on academic careers as well as faculty and administrators in positions to improve the work environment consider some important issues in decision making about potential ongoing stressors that often are primarily controlled by the institution. These may include the compatibility and reality of personal and professional goals; skills to be cultivated such as proactive planning and establishing and maintaining limits; and attention to personal life (DiNitto, Aguilar, Franklin, & Jordan, 1995). A study of male college faculty in the Midwest identified five stages of an academic career, characterizing full professors with more than five years until retirement as making decisions about continuing teaching or diversifying their experiences (i.e., administrative roles) (Baldwin, 1979; Baldwin & Blackburn, 1981; Mathis, 1979). This stage of faculty life brings questions such as whether or not to maintain a career path similar to their current one or to attempt something new for the sake of variety and stimulation (Lawrence, 1984).

Opportunities for possible career renewal may be available to these individuals, allowing them to achieve what Erickson identified as "generativity," a stage in middle adult life of choice-making about active engagement with society and the legacy that will be left (as cited in Evans, Forney & Guido-DiBrito, 1998). Those within five years of retirement were

characterized by fear that their knowledge is outdated, limited goals, withdrawal from responsibilities, and comfort with their departmental or college service roles (Baldwin, 1979; Baldwin & Blackburn, 1981). Other researchers offered a category of "midlife faculty," defined as faculty "... in their late 30's to mid or late 50's . . .," often coinciding with the associate and full professor ranks (Cytrynbaum, Lee, & Wadner, 1982, p. 15), who were described as being characteristically stagnant, withdrawn, and disinterested in such activities as teaching and research. According to Mathis (1979), this career stage involved a shift from focusing energy on acquiring promotion and tenure to an "increasing expenditure of energy required to maintain a career on the same terms by which it reached mid-point in the first place" (p. 22).

Productivity, as defined by publications, continues to be a concern but did not decline in later career stages, according to Astin and Davis (1993). Instead, they found full professors to be most productive along with a greater relative increase in publications for post-tenure women. In their study of social scientists, Astin and Davis found that married women were more productive than single women, and their productivity was comparable to married men. However, single women published more books and book chapters than married men or women, with married men and women producing more articles. "The study indicates that married women may learn early on what they need in terms of commitment to maintain their research and publishing activities" (Astin cited in Chamberlain, 1988, p. 269).

In one study of male and female faculty members at mid-career, some made and maintained strict differentiations between work and non-work lives while others preferred rather seamless connections between these aspects. The blurring was, in this study, more associated with men who had relatively traditional marital relationships (Quinn, O'Neill, & Debebe, 1996). A female reflective essayist observed that a satisfying personal life, as with a satisfying work life, does not simply happen without attention and appropriate strategies and management activities (Huff, 1996). However, demands of academic life include task and responsibility expectations that draw faculty members away from their research, and these competing demands for time and energy tend to increase over one's academic career (Quinn et al., 1996).

Women identified spouse and family as variables that helped, not hindered, their progress. However, in a subsample of highly productive academics from a study of 9,000 faculty at 92 institutions, Astin (cited in Chamberlain, 1988) noted that women identified expectations they could control, such as family, teaching and committees, as limitations, while men's identified limitations involved less personal control.

Although a faculty member may have a long career of 40 or more years, in which publishing could be a constant expectation, changes in professional and personal lives occur continually, resulting in complex configurations of major as well as minor transitions. When examining the various stages of faculty life, transitions seem frequent for individuals in these roles. Schlossberg, Waters, and Goodman (1995) defined a transition as “. . . any event or nonevent that results in change in relationships, routines, assumptions, and roles” (p. 27). Types of stress cited include anticipated (e.g., achievement of promotion and tenure), unanticipated (e.g., denial of promotion and/or tenure), chronic hassles (e.g., everyday irritations, or experiences of “cultural taxation” experienced by women and under-represented faculty [Padilla as cited in Tierney & Bensimon, 1996]), and nonevents (e.g., unexpectedly delayed or unaccomplished goals) (Schlossberg et al., 1995). Echoing a broad perspective shared by phenomenological methodologists, understanding transitions requires examination of the type and context of the experience as well as the impact of the experience on daily life (Schlossberg et al., 1995). The nature of faculty work, their career stages, and the transitional aspects of an evolving faculty career can all affect the personal and professional balance for female faculty members. This information provides a context and background for examining the data.

Methodological Framework

Phenomenological and feminist methodologies and assumptions provided the overarching theoretical framework for this study. Proceeding from a phenomenological approach, primary attention was placed on understanding the phenomenon of balance in mid- to late-career lives of women professors through careful focus on participants’ descriptions of episodes from their own experiences and the meanings participants ascribed to these experiences. Additionally, a feminist standpoint theoretical framework was adopted by proceeding from “the spoken experience of actual women speaking of and in the actualities of their everyday world” (Smith, 1987, p. 107) towards “exploring and explicating the relations in which our everyday worlds are embedded” (Smith, 1987, p. 111). The goal of this research project is to better understand and convey the social realities of mid- to late-career stage faculty life experienced by this group of respondents and the social and organizational practices that reinforce and affirm these realities. Additionally, this study provides insight into these respondents’ social worlds (Bernard, 1973; Millman & Kanter, 1987) and the life and work circumstances that are crucial parts of these worlds.

Methods and Data Analysis

Each of the 70 women with “professor” rank at a Research I Land Grant institution (1,395 full-time faculty, including 685 with professor rank at the time of data collection) were invited to participate in a study on a variety of characteristics, experiences, and perceptions of women professors. Twenty-six respondents representing a variety of academic disciplines and fields agreed to be interviewed. All respondents were white and non-Hispanic, as were approximately 88% of women at professor rank nationwide around the time of data collection (Knopp, 1995). Years at professor rank were similar between the groups of participants and non-participants. The social sciences and education areas were slightly over-represented while the arts and humanities disciplines were slightly under-represented (see Table 1).

Table 1.
Distributions Among Academic Disciplines, Fields, or Specialties

	Women at Professor Rank (70)	Respondent Group (26)
Arts and Humanities (AH)	26%	19%
Biological and Agricultural Sciences (BAS)	17%	19%
Physical and Mathematical Sciences and Engineering (PMSE)	6%	4%
Social Sciences and Education (SSE)	51%	58%

All interviews were audiotaped and fully transcribed to facilitate systematic analysis through use of the constant comparative method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) to identify common themes and concepts (Rubin & Rubin, 1995) across the interviews. To ensure descriptive and interpretive validity, opportunities for clarification were presented during the interviews, and two forms of post-interview member-checking (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) were conducted.

In the discussion that follows, “discipline” is used when discussing academic discipline, professional field, or specialty in order to streamline the

presentation. Additionally, respondents were assured anonymity with respect to specific departmental affiliation, so the four aggregate categories in Table 1 are used to characterize respondents' academic backgrounds.

According to analysis of institutional data, women professors at the university received their terminal degrees between 1950 and 1988. The mean completion date was 1975, the mode was 1981, and the median was 1976. Among respondents, this range was 1950-1986, with a mean of 1974 and mode and median of 1975. Although a similar range was evident in the respondent group, more respondents were clustered in the earlier dates than in the target population. Additionally, respondents reported a variety of personal circumstances, ranging from unmarried or divorced to being involved in committed partnerships or marriages. The majority of respondents were in committed partnerships or marriages. Most respondents were mothers and/or stepmothers, but the ages of children at the time of data collection ranged from elementary school-aged to college-aged to adult.

One caution associated with this study is that the following discussion points cannot fully characterize all female professors' experiences or perceptions—much less the experiences of everyone in the respondent group. Not surprisingly, the respondents did not speak with one voice or share all of the same experiences or perspectives. In the following analysis and discussion, the “prevailing winds” across the data (Frye, 1990) are described while attempts are also made to convey the variety of perspectives within the respondent group.

Findings

Five major themes characterized respondents' experiences surrounding balance of personal and professional lives as senior faculty members. These themes are: modification of expectations; making peace with past decisions; self-sufficiency and choice; senior leadership opportunities and expectations; and personal health and well-being. In many ways, the first three themes describe personal viewpoints and/or self-management strategies predominantly characteristic among the respondent group while the fourth and fifth themes describe sets of new circumstances faced by respondents that have called their attention to issues of balance and life coherence.

The extent to which these themes were emphasized among respondents depended somewhat upon how they viewed and structured their work lives. While a small number of respondents described what one respondent termed an “interdigitated” life in which life roles were interwoven and largely commingled, most respondents spoke instead of the desirability and effectiveness associated with maintaining separation of personal and

professional lives. Some respondents were married to or shared life partnerships with fellow academics—a few with same-department colleagues. Others, however, expressed relief that their spouses or partners were not academics and/or had nothing to do with the university. Such separation introduced even more distance between one's career life and personal life, yet this also could be experienced as more fragmentary.

Modification of Expectations

The first theme focused on modifying one's expectations so that they were more realistic and manageable. Expectations at issue included respondents' amended expectations of realistic limits for work hours. One Biological and Agricultural Sciences (BAS) respondent noted: "[Work] gets done at night, early mornings, Saturdays and Sundays, and eventually one reaches a point to say, 'Enough. I can't do it.' . . . I need to strike a balance at some point." A Social Sciences and Education (SSE) respondent noted that she came to realize and validate her capacity for work and associated productivity: "I think what I have accomplished professionally is what I could accomplish. You know, I think I'm working at the level that I can work."

Other aspects of modifying expectations included a focus on the evolving nature of life as well as faculty life. A Physical and Mathematical Sciences and Engineering (PMSE) respondent discussed this aspect: "I don't think your career responsibilities stay static. And my personal life, my kids are going to get to the point where they're independent. They're going to be gone, . . . so I'll have more time to spend on my career." She also acknowledged, however, the need to anticipate and adapt to potentially discomfiting life changes, stating that she was reading about mid-life crises, or "mid-life growth experiences, I like to call them," that she and many of her colleagues were experiencing. She explained, "There's a lot of chaos going on in your head. . . . It's just sort of facing up to where you are in your life."

Children played important roles in respondents' setting of expectations for themselves as scholars as well as parents and community members. One Arts and Humanities (AH) respondent noted the difficulty of leaving relatively young children to engage in research as well as the pride in her subsequent scholarly accomplishments. Regarding leaving her child in order to travel to do her work, she stated, "I had to wait to get to that place until he was old enough for me to say, 'I'm ready to go now and do this.' It's the best thing I've ever done in my research."

In one rather unique example of evolving circumstances with children and accompanying modification of expectations, one SSE respondent noted

that her daughter provided community engagement and enforced leisure during her childhood:

Children at home tie you in differently and wonderfully to community. . . .
If you have children, you go to all their sporting events, you go to all their academic events. It requires you to have this whole leisure life.

Now, as an adult and fellow academic, this respondent's daughter provides colleagueship that encompasses the respondent's husband as well: "Both my husband and I are involved, and my older daughter is involved in this particular international research program. Things sort of happen, and we try to make them happen so we can all do stuff together."

Making Peace With Past Decisions

Another strategy or perspective that respondents discussed was making peace with past decisions they had made. Most of the respondents did not nurse or dwell on regrets, but rather sought to interpret past choices or events as part of their unfolding careers and lives. Even if those choices or events had been disappointing or alarming at the time, respondents employed immediate perspective and/or contemporary hindsight to place the event in the larger context of their career or life and the accompanying priorities they placed on each. One SSE respondent discussed an invitation to apply for an endowed professorship at another university that would have involved expectations "to be public, to be available" which did not fit with her current role as a mother. She stated:

I really just like being a regular professor. I mean, it would have been totally cool to be an endowed chair and have—it was a \$2 million endowment, so there was a lot of money—but I like just doing my own thing in my office, and not having people that I have to satisfy.

A respondent from BAS echoed the general refrain among respondents that, since excessive worrying, preoccupation, and revisiting choices serve little purpose, one ought not engage in them. She said, "You have to make some decisions, and you simply make those decisions, and then you move on. . . . [I]f certain things don't happen because of that; that's all right. There are other good things that have happened."

Another SSE respondent described her own individual choices in the face of perceived social pressures to become more involved in her children's lives, concluding that she not only rejected the social pressures but also rejected the guilt that can otherwise accompany choices to focus on one's career. She declared that she did not feel guilt about not taking on roles, such as "den mother for the boy scouts." However, this professor recognized that

other women did feel guilty about not taking on such roles. She stated that these women then were angry at their jobs or their bosses: "And then they think it's not fair, and how could the world not support them in doing this other thing, and it sort of feeds on itself. Doesn't bother me."

A third SSE respondent spoke about making peace with her work choices as a faculty member that resulted in fewer rewards, particularly in terms of remuneration:

I probably feel I haven't been paid as well, and I've already addressed that, because I haven't had the national reputation as a researcher, and that's driven the salaries, I think, to a certain degree. In some ways, that sometimes bothers me, but it hasn't been a big hangup. In other words, I don't dwell on it.

Self-sufficiency and Choice

This theme describes the underlying assumptions made across the respondent group of longstanding self-sufficiency with respect to most aspects of their lives. They emphasized choices and decisions that were disproportionately theirs to control, and they articulated few expectations of assistance from the university that were non-work-related. Some respondents indicated gratitude for the flexibility of schedule offered by the institution. As one AH respondent put it: "I'm eternally grateful for that kind of flexibility in my life [university schedules], because it's allowed me to do some things." However, most described choices about time, family, and personal investment that highlighted the challenges associated with "doing it all." A PMSE respondent noted the challenges of balance, stating, "You know, it's possible to do all this, but is it requiring you to be a superperson, a superwoman, I mean, in order to manage all these things? . . . [S]ome years are better than others."

Issues of time also included issues related to family life. They also involved recognizing the limitations of available time for hobbies and other activities for enjoyment outside of work. One AH respondent commented on the stress associated with the amount of time she chose to spend preparing for classes, but also noted her responsibility for these decisions. This professor acknowledged stressors that she defined as "self-created," such as her tendency to "overprepare or overrespond to students," in addition to spending time with the students, grading papers, and completing other necessary tasks. "That's a stress that I create and I don't have to create. . . . I choose to be that kind of teacher. . . . I don't feel like that's caused by the institution. It's caused by myself," she admitted.

Making decisions about how to delegate her time between various projects focused on prioritization for one BAS respondent. She mentioned pressures from "outside the professional work" that present challenges to her

professional work. However, when making decisions about priorities and delegating her time, her work was highest on her list: “[M]y highest priority is to the work that I do for the university, and so other things are more or less relegated to less time.”

For some, their university work was the highest priority at this point in their lives. For others, their families took a higher priority, and for both groups, balance was the challenge. However, life choices were not always clear-cut or identified as personal versus professional domains, but instead involved interrelated professional and personal choices about bearing children as well as working to support them. According to one SSE respondent, putting off child-bearing until after tenure was a reality she accepted:

To me it has always seemed very arbitrary for people to say, ‘Well . . . you shouldn’t have to put off child-bearing until you have tenure, or until you have a good job’. . . . [T]o me, ‘Yes, you do.’ You need to have income. You need to be able to support [children], and so it’s really difficult or impossible to separate what you choose personally from what you’re doing professionally, because it’s all so interrelated.

Being a mother was a significant role for many of the respondents. Finding ways to establish balance between professional responsibilities and family obligations required careful decision-making for which respondents took ownership. One SSE respondent “put things on hold for being a parent” which she defined as positive because she chose to prioritize parenting. She stated, “That was what I wanted to do, so that was my primary emphasis.”

In some respondents’ estimation, family obligations were viewed as an impediment to professional progress as well as a sign of gender bias in academe. An AH respondent commented that her career may have moved less quickly due to her role as a mother “. . . [H]ad I not devoted the amount of time that I did to the children, maybe I would have gotten promoted faster. . . . Maybe that’s one of the reasons that things went slowly for me.” However, she stated that [time focused on her children instead of her career] “didn’t feel like a compromise at the time,” perhaps because she viewed both as “doable within the same life, and I just took for granted that I could have both.”

Choosing not to be involved in certain projects became an important realization and skill for these women. Learning to say “no”—either as a skill or as a struggle—was mentioned by a number of respondents. A BAS professor stated that she needed to permit herself to say “no” which likely would result in personal and professional benefits: “. . . I would be better off

as a person—I might be better off as a faculty member—if I would do fewer things than I do.”

Saying “no” came with the acknowledgement of the consequences, such as this case in which a SSE respondent discussed curtailing personal interests in favor of acknowledged priorities. According to her, “[It]’s not a matter of doing everything now. It’s a matter of doing it at the right time, and right now I have to focus on the family and career.” She accepted these sacrifices by reminding herself that she would participate in her desired hobbies and interests at a later time.

Some respondents stated alternate views, including critiques of a system premised on male lives as models, with no consideration of the variations and different consequences for women. Particularly with respect to health, one PMSE respondent stated that she was fortunate to have had healthy pregnancies because she was able to meet her professional responsibilities. However, she concluded, “[I]t’s not easy to plan all this and then expect your body to agree with this plan that you have. I think there’s really no flexibility in the system.”

The small-town location of the campus—plus the perceived conservative nature of the university—provided for many an incompatibility with their more liberal values and interests, while for others it provided a sense of comfort and family. For those who found it incompatible, the result was fewer readily available opportunities to act on social values and commitments, yet for some this amounted to fewer distractions from their scholarly work. For this AH respondent, there are no barriers to prevent her acting on her commitments and values, but she expects to be dismissed because she perceived that she was viewed as “a well-known liberal and troublemaker, a person who will open her mouth maybe when she shouldn’t.” She cited, as an example, participating in faculty senate meetings. When she raised an issue, she felt that it was ignored, but when a “conservative male picks up that same point 20 minutes later, then they do pay attention to it.” This professor was uncertain as to whether she was dismissed because of her gender or because of her political ideology. However, she identified her institution as being more conservative, and stated, “You know, this is [university name]. I sort of expect the liberal position to be dismissed. . . .”

For those who found the community comfortable, some also found that their social situations within the community were comprised of people—in many cases university colleagues—whom they referred to as almost like family. One AH respondent observed, “My life is also very wrapped up in this department socially, too. My husband also teaches in this department. Most of our friends are in this department. . . . [I]t’s our own little

community now.” She identified the benefits of this “community” as having people with whom she shared common interests and concerns. “We complain about the same things,” she stated.

An SSE respondent compared the distractions in the community with the potential distractions in other communities in which she had lived or might have lived, noting that the current community did not distract her in the same way as she would have anticipated elsewhere. She stated that it would be more challenging to stay focused on her work in a larger community that offered opportunities beyond the university community to compete for her attention.

Institutional distractions for one SSE faculty member came in the form of male chauvinism. This professor also identified this issue at the state level and on the campus. She indicated that some comments by men “just absolutely boggle [her] mind” and that “to be sort of colloquial about it, they just don’t get it yet.” This professor believed that, on the campus and within the state, a change in this chauvinism would take a long time.

Senior Leadership Opportunities and Expectations

As senior professors, most acknowledged having more control over aspects of their work, lives, and time, although this expression was less prevalent among the respondents who had school-aged children. But even among the respondents with older or adult children, this did not mean that time they had earlier devoted to their young children’s needs was now “freed up.” Instead, that time was filled with additional career involvements such as administrative appointments, leadership within their field or discipline, or teaching loads. With respect to these commitments, most respondents also characterized these as choices to an extent. They were also quick to point out that they were among the individuals best positioned to contribute to the work and advancement of their departments and/or disciplines because of their senior professor status. Respondents understood that they were now in a position to take leadership roles that others not similarly situated in terms of rank could do. For example, one PMSE respondent discussed her leadership role in her professional society and potential leadership within her home department, due in part to her rank as well as the small number of full professors. She stated, “My new department head is relying a lot on me because I’m the only other full professor. . . . All of a sudden I will become a senior person, and not just in terms of rank but in age.”

Some opportunities for leadership on the campus, primarily increased administrative appointments and committee work, were accepted with somewhat less enthusiasm by respondents, as shown by a BAS faculty member who indicated that she was “being pulled in that direction much

stronger than I really want to be.” While this professor stated that she prefers to work in her lab, she also acknowledged that she is one of the senior members who can, and is expected to, do that type of work.

Several respondents, though, noted the positives of new and unanticipated challenges as new opportunities for leadership or learning. An SSE respondent echoed the enthusiasm about facing new (and more) challenges as a senior professor. She identified dramatic changes since being promoted, although she was not certain if the promotion was the only reason for the change: “[T]hings have really gone into high gear. . . . I do know that I have been approached for certain things because I am—people will say, we need a full professor for this.”

In their research agendas in particular, respondents also relished the freedom of being more selective in their choices without pressure to turn around publications quickly. According to one SSE respondent, she was able to be more thoughtful about choosing what to work on: “. . . [I]n the life cycle of research, I’m at a stage where I’m starting more activities, and I’m being a little more careful about ‘Is this an area that I really want to study, that I personally want to work on?’” These reports of rejuvenation and fresh challenges, however, were somewhat tempered by respondents’ increased attention to their own health and providing care for aging family members.

Personal Health and Well Being

Respondents were increasingly aware of their health and well being as an important aspect of their lives and as a key condition that would enable them to continue their work and fulfill their chosen commitments. Given that respondents ranged from mid-40s to 60s, physical signs related to aging could be expected. Consequently, for many respondents, larger proportions of their available time and energy were spent on some level of attention to health and well being. Thoughts of retirement and planning for retirement were also discussed. For one PMSE respondent, menopause and its implications had recently become a concern, specifically regarding having higher levels of responsibility at that stage in life: “I keep hearing about this post-menopausal zest. I can’t wait to get to be 51, 52. . . . I’m trying to talk to other women, too, about ‘How did you get through it?’”

Decisions focused on personal well being were mentioned by some respondents. Whether that took the form of physical exercise/activity, meditation, or quiet time alone, these women identified the values and necessity of their choices. For one SSE respondent, her exercise time also brings stress relief and the benefit of community with other women. She commented on the value of the relationships that resulted from her daily

noon swim: “[T]here’s such a nice group of women over there, and it’s so nice to talk to women after being in this male-dominated department.”

Taking care of self was coupled with taking care of parents for some respondents. Some were actively engaged in care giving or overseeing arrangements for care, while others had experienced deaths of parents. An SSE respondent described her current care arrangements for her elderly parents, which involved heavy time commitments on her part such as assisting them in packing to move to a care facility. She described using vacation time and taking extended weekends to help them, but lamented the fact that she could not be with them more regularly.

Personal well being, in the form of planning for the future, also emerged during the interviews. Retirement and the impact of outside forces, and how retirement may affect their work, was discussed by the following SSE respondent who indicated she was “fretting over the stock market, ‘Will it hold up long enough for us to retire?’”

Aspects of aging that involve even slight deterioration in capabilities or a generalized slowing down were noted by almost all respondents as concerns in their own right. Additionally, however, health and care-giving issues also called attention to respondents’ abilities to continue their academic work and fulfill the professional commitments that they had either made or envisioned for themselves. Despite the focus on health and well being, most respondents remained optimistic about the remainders of their careers into retirement. They also envisioned the remainders of their working lives as full and productive.

Discussion

Schlossberg, Troll, and Leibowitz (1978) documented a shift during adulthood from thinking of life in terms of time since birth to thinking of life remaining until death. Many respondents echoed this perspective by focusing on their future time, and time until retirement. Some have made careful and strategic plans, particularly for research projects and undertakings for what they consider to be their remaining years. For several respondents, their health and bodies are complicating factors as they also experience aging. The respondents’ having made peace with past decisions and judgments as indicated above may be making such a shift towards thinking in terms of time remaining. For most respondents, the forward thinking is focused professionally on research projects and what can be accomplished in the time remaining. The personal aspects related to time remaining included aging, retirement planning, and evolving care considerations. Respondents discussed these professional and personal considerations as mutually-

influential, but the more commonly articulated dynamic focused on impacts of personal health on energy and abilities to fulfill professional commitments.

Compartmentalization also was a valuable skill for respondents in managing personal and professional demands/life. Only a few respondents described a life that blended professional life with personal life; most often respondents spoke of the considered and deliberate trade-offs. However, in their reminiscences, respondents also accepted their decisions and voiced few regrets about past decisions. Many choices centered on desires to be involved in their children's lives. Respondents also discussed being involved in their spouse or partner's life, yet spouse or partner involvement was seen as posing fewer, and less pressing, time and energy demands. Compartmentalization was also apparent in aspects of their professional lives, as respondents who also held administrative appointments discussed segmenting their research time and their administrative time as a strategy to address the demands of both. In many ways, respondents developed the skills of "throwing switches" numerous times in a day as they assumed one role or another. Respondents also became adept at selective focusing depending upon the "switched on" situation. Additionally, the temporal and evolving nature of commitments was also highlighted as respondents discussed the attention and energy on children that would abate (or had abated) as their children became adults. Analogously, they discussed the need to work hard early on to establish a strong scholarly foundation and then make subsequent decisions about research project involvements, funding cycles, and related priorities that tended to ebb and flow over their academic careers.

Even among the respondents who were within a few years of retirement, a sense of downshifting accompanied by resignation or despair was not apparent in the respondent group. Those respondents who were primarily teachers discussed new methods of teaching and the energy that they gave and received from students. With respect to their scholarly work and laboratories, some respondents discussed projects or alternate careers that they would continue to pursue past retirement. Far from the bitterness or fear associated with retirement among Baldwin and Blackburn's (1981) respondents, the career denouement among respondents discussing retirement was associated with senses of satisfaction and in some cases renewal that was focused into their retirement years. Exceptions to this pattern included respondents with health challenges that were debilitating on some level, drawing attention to the diminished capabilities or endurance that would not allow them to keep up with their plans.

Implications

Problems with balancing personal and professional lives are often associated with early career years in which childbearing, child rearing, intimate relationship formation, and career establishment are frequently occurring. As this study makes clear, balancing professional and personal expectations and goals are not only an early career phenomenon. The nature of professional demands and expectations change as academic careers evolve, and family and personal commitments evolve as well, but the need for setting priorities and making choices continues. More studies are needed to determine the nature of the challenges, demands, and successful negotiations of academic life at all career stages as well as how institutions can encourage and benefit from the kinds of prime-career and late-career generativity that characterized most of the respondents in this study.

Particularly among the women faculty members studied, the strategies of modifying expectations, making peace with the past, and compartmentalizing personal and professional lives were discussed frequently and characterized as effective. The compartmentalization is consistent with Quinn et al.'s (1996) findings on female faculty members' structuring of their lives. Based on prior studies establishing the (male) gendered nature of academic life (e.g., Park, 1996), perhaps the bridge between many women's personal lives and their lives as academics remains too long to span comfortably, much less combine into a relatively seamless existence. In such cases when aspects of one's life are not seen as readily reconcilable, the technique of throwing switches without dwelling overmuch on the distances spanned during these switching occurrences may help avoid perceptions of or emphasis on role disjunctures. Respondents did not discuss the acquisition of these techniques. Consequently, it is also not clear from this study whether these switching techniques were learned or otherwise adopted during the course of their careers and lives, or perhaps whether a measure of their successful advancement in this particular work environment may be accountable to their successful exercise of these techniques.

Further study is also needed on the possible gender differences in how end-of-career time is constructed or regarded. Although prior studies characterized full professors as stagnant and disinterested (Cytrynbaum et al., 1982) or fearful and withdrawn (Baldwin & Blackburn, 1981), respondents in this study instead expressed relative degrees of optimism and pleasure in facing new challenges and learning new things. Although gender differences may exist with respect to interpretations of aging and one's relative contributions and usefulness, it may additionally be the case that the nature and experience of faculty work have changed and evolved since studies

conducted in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Respondents in the current study received their terminal degrees, on average, in 1974. This is approximately the same time frame in which Baldwin (1979), and Baldwin and Blackburn (1981), conducted their studies of academic life stages. Almost 30 years ago, female Ph.D. students (particularly in male-dominated fields) may not have regarded faculty members in their departments as the (sole) role models on which their assumptions about academic life would be based. This could particularly be the case if female graduate students were also searching for models of what strategies, given their personal as well as professional goals, would work best for them, or examples of what their careers and lives as future faculty members might be like. Research that explores evolving academic socialization as well as strategies for balancing professional and personal lives in attempts to create one's own coherent life may advance understanding of ranges of possible strategies for pursuing career and personal success.

Finally, if large numbers of senior women professors desire to continue working in some professional capacity into their retirement years, institutional implications for faculty emerita status, lab space, and departmental support may also arise. Institutions of higher education may have access to previously unrealized potentials for leadership, scholarship, and role modeling in their senior faculty ranks. However, if such potential is to be tapped, local if not institutional facilities to promote wellness and health, plus time and support for their use, also appear to be critical resources for senior faculty members.

Note

We wish to acknowledge Dr. Mary Huba's work in conducting approximately half of the interviews and Dr. Karen Zunkel's arrangement of interview appointments and her contributions to the research project.

References

- Astin, H. S., & Davis, D. E. (1993). Research productivity across the life and career cycles: Facilitators and barriers for women. In J. S. Glazer, E. M. Bensimon, & B. K. Townsend (Eds.), *Women in higher education: A feminist perspective* (pp. 415-424). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn.
- Baldwin, R. (1979). Adult and career development: What are the implications for faculty? In *Current Issues in Higher Education* (pp. 25-28). Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education.
- Baldwin, R. G., & Blackburn, R. T. (1981). The academic career as a developmental process: Implications for higher education. *Journal of Higher Education*, 52(6), 598-614.

- Bernard, J. (1973). My four revolutions: An autobiographical history of the ASA. In J. Huber (Ed.), *Changing women in a changing society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Chamberlain, M. K. (Ed.). (1988). Faculty women: Preparation, participation, and progress. In *Women in academe: Progress and prospects* (pp. 255-274). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Cytrynbaum, S., Lee, S., & Wadner, D. (1982, Spring). Faculty development through the life course: Application of recent adult development theory and research. *Journal of Instructional Development*, 5(3), 11-21.
- DiNitto, D., Aguilar, M. A., Franklin, C., & Jordan, C. (1995). Over the edge? Women and tenure in today's academic environment. *Affilia*, 10(3), 255-279.
- Evans, N. J., Forney, D. S., & Guido-DiBrito, F. (1998). *Student development in college: Theory, research, and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Frye, M. (1990). The possibility of feminist theory. In D. L. Rhode (Ed.), *Theoretical perspectives on sexual difference* (pp. 174-184). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Gallos, J. V. (1989). Exploring women's development: Implications for career theory, practice, and research. In M. B. Arthur, D. T. Hall, & B. S. Lawrence (Eds.), *Handbook of career theory* (pp. 110-132). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gilligan, C. (1993). Woman's place in man's life cycle. In J. S. Glazer, E. M. Bensimon, & B. K. Townsend (Eds.), *Women in higher education: A feminist perspective* (pp. 23-34). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Huff, A. S. (1996). Professional and personal life. In P. J. Frost & M. S. Taylor (Eds.), *Rhythms of academic life* (pp. 429-434). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Knopp, L. (1995). *Women in higher education today: A mid-1990s profile* (Research Briefs, Vol. 6, No. 5). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Lawrence, J. H. (1984). Faculty age and teaching. In C. M. N. Mehrotra (Ed.), *Teaching and aging*. (New Directions for Teaching and Learning No. 19, pp. 57-65). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Mathis, B. C. (1979). Academic careers and adult development: A nexus for research. In American Association for Higher Education (Ed.), *Current issues in higher education* (pp. 21-24). Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education.
- Millman, M., & Kanter, R. M. (1987). Introduction to *Another Voice: Feminist perspectives on social life and social science*. In S. Harding (Ed.), *Feminism and methodology* (pp. 29-36). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Park, S. (1996). Research, teaching, and service. Why shouldn't women's work count? *Journal of Higher Education*, 67, 46-84.
- Quinn, R. E., O'Neill, R. M., & Debebe, G. (1996). Confronting the tensions in an academic career. In P. J. Frost & M. S. Taylor (Eds.), *Rhythms of academic life* (pp. 421-427). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (1995). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schlossberg, N. K., Troll, L. E., & Leibowitz, Z. (1978). *Perspectives on counseling adults: Issues and skills*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Schlossberg, N. K., Waters, E. B., & Goodman, J. (1995). *Counseling adults in transition: Linking practice with theory* (2nd ed.). New York: Springer.
- Sharf, R. F. (2001). Introduction. In R. S. Sharf, *Applying career development theory to counseling* (3rd ed.) (pp. 1-22). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Smith, D. E. (1987). *The everyday world as problematic: A feminist sociology*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). *Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

PIONEER WOMEN IN MANITOBA: EVIDENCE OF SERVANT- LEADERSHIP

Carolyn L. Crippen

Leadership was characterized as patriarchal and hierarchical during the 19th and early 20th centuries. Pioneer women were often not credited with leadership qualities although many, including school teachers, journalists, suffragettes, healthcare workers, and social activists played an important role in the development of Manitoba communities. This study hypothesized that women were engaged in unrecognized leadership strategies within that contemporary culture. This research explored whether three particular Manitoba pioneer women, Margaret Scott (1855-1931), Margret Benedictsson (1866-1956), and Jessie McDermott (1870-1950), did, in fact, practice a form of leadership. This leadership form was identified as servant-leadership and defined by Robert K. Greenleaf (1904-1990) in his seminal work, *Servant as Leader* (1970/1991b). Areas of investigation included leadership theory; Manitoba history, and the role of women during the time period that was common to their lives, 1870-1930. Qualitative historical analysis methodology was used to examine the lives of the three women. Various primary sources (archival papers, autobiographies, newspapers, letters, historical photographs, and committee minutes) and secondary sources (texts related to Manitoba history, journal articles, and servant-leadership theory) were utilized. Data enabled the construction of biographical profiles of the lives of the three women. It was not the intent of the author to rewrite their histories, but rather to analyze their lives and related materials for evidence of the ten characteristics (or their proxies) of servant-leadership: listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, conceptualization, and foresight, commitment to the growth of people, stewardship, and building community.

Evidence of all 10 characteristics of servant-leadership appeared in greater abundance or frequency, depending upon the woman involved. Themes of learning, religious foundation, enabling of others, and altruism were common to the women. Their call to

About the Author

Carolyn Crippen, Ph.D., has extensive administrative and teaching experience in public education in Ontario and Manitoba and has either taught or administered (Principal & Superintendent) from Junior Kindergarten—Graduate Level. She has presented in Canada and the United States and works closely with school divisions and educational agencies across Manitoba. She is a University of Manitoba instructor (Faculty of Education). Dr. Crippen completed her doctoral studies at the University of North Dakota with a research focus on servant-leadership.

servant-leadership came at an early age. These Manitoba immigrants were active church members; pursued education; all married, and each lived in Winnipeg at one time; and lived into old age. They served their communities first, and it was through their service they became recognized as leaders.

The pioneer women of Manitoba hold an important place in Canadian history. No record of our country's past will be of greater interest or more inspiring than the record of their lives, if ever their lives are adequately recorded, as they should be. (Healy, 1923, p. 260)

Introduction

William J. Healy (1867-1950), the Provincial Librarian of Manitoba, wrote this tribute to pioneer women in his book, *Women of Red River: Being a book written from the recollections of women surviving from the Red River era* (1923, p.23). The following research addresses Healy's suggestion that the lives of pioneer women were interesting and inspiring and that they demonstrated specific leadership characteristics. The life records of three Manitoba pioneer women were investigated in response to Healy's opening statement.

Purpose of Study

In the late 1800s and the early years of the 1900s women were often not credited with leadership qualities. This study hypothesized that women were engaged in unrecognized and covert leadership strategies within their contemporary culture. Did these women, in fact, practice servant-leadership as defined by Robert K. Greenleaf (1904-1990) in his seminal work, *Servant as Leader* (1970/1991b)?

Background of Study

Three areas of influence were examined: the concept of leadership and in particular, servant-leadership; the history of Manitoba in the time period common to the lives of all three women, 1870-1930; and the role of women during that same time.

Leadership

Leadership prior to the 20th century was defined as being hierarchical, patriarchal, often related to wealth and influence of position (Bennis, 1997, p. 104-105; Owens, 1995/2001, p. 241-243). In contrast, the paradoxical term servant-leadership is inclusive of personal service to society regardless of position (Block, 1996, p.6-7) and it was through strategies of service and stewardship, that a leader was identified by the people to be a leader among equals (Greenleaf, 1976, p.16; De Pree, 1989, p. 145; Owens, 1995/2001. p. 254-255). A servant-leader was described by Greenleaf (1970/1991b) as,

Servant first. It begins with the natural feeling that one wants to serve. Then conscious choice brings one to aspire to lead. The difference manifests itself in the care taken by the servant-first, to make sure that other people's highest priority needs are being served. The best test is: do those served grow as persons; do they, while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous, more likely themselves to become servants? And what of the least privileged in society: will they benefit, or, at least, not be further deprived? (p. 7)

Role of Women

The latter part of the 1800s in Canada and in Manitoba (provincial status, 1870) was dominated by the cultural norms of the Victorian Period (1837-1901): the keeper of the home fires, nurturer of children, and the constant companion and supporter of her husband. This behavior was accepted and expected particularly by the middle and upper classes, including the government and church. Kinnear (1998, p.62) states, "Almost all women, rural and urban, rich and poor, accepted homemaking as women's work." Service to others was a moral obligation felt by the server as the right thing to do. It seems likely that the three women in the study were influenced by the Social Gospel, described by Prentice, Bourne, Brandt, Light, Mitchison, & Black (1996):

Women were particularly active in the Protestant Social Gospel movement at the turn of the century, a movement which links to earlier evangelicalism and devoted to the establishment of God's kingdom on earth and thus to the reform of the temporal world. To work for social reform seemed to women in the movement a logical extension of their maternalism." (p. 164)

Manitoba History

The Canadian prairie province of Manitoba is situated between the industrial province of Ontario and the farming province of Saskatchewan. Originally this land was inhabited by several distinct groups of First Nations people. By the 1850s the west was seen not as a wilderness but as a possibility for large communities and settlements. Canadian Confederation came in 1867 and Manitoba was the first western province to join in 1870. In 1872 under the Dominion Lands Act, settlers received a 160 acre homestead for ten dollars. If settlers could erect a house on the property and clear 30 acres of land within three years, they received clear title to the property. The transcontinental railway was built across Manitoba in 1881-1882 and immigrants were encouraged to settle in groups or colonies on the prairies. Russians, French Canadians, Icelanders, Ukrainians, Scots, Romanians, and Germans came to the prairies to establish their homes. The growing culturally diverse City of Winnipeg became a magnet for those looking for work and a Canadian financial center and railway hub (Friesen, 1987, p. 186-204).

Description of the Sample

In 1870 the recorded population in Manitoba was 24,000; by 1911 the population had increased to 461, 393 (Kinnear, 1998, p. 11, 17-18). Prentice, Bourne, Brandt, Light, Mitchinson, & Black (1996, p. 113) commented on the move by women into the cities (including Winnipeg), "Women continued to lead the shift in the population, because they moved to the cities for employment opportunities that the rural could not offer them." The three women selected for the following study, i.e., Margaret Scott, volunteer and social service innovator,(1855-1931); Margret Benedictsson, journalist and human rights activist, (1866-1956); and Jessie McDermott, teacher and rural community builder (1870-1950) were first identified in a small book of two-page vignettes, *Extraordinary, Ordinary Women* (Armstrong, 2000) published by the Manitoba Club of the Canadian Federation of University Women. After reading the book, the writer was drawn to their life stories: roles, community initiatives, and possible leadership style.

The Three Women in Brief

Margaret Ruttan Boucher Scott was born in Colborne, Ontario and later moved to Peterborough with her family. She was orphaned at 12 years. (1867) and then lived with an aunt. At twenty-two, she married a Peterborough lawyer but became a widow within three years. Without a means of support, Scott sought employment and found work with the Midland Railway sorting tickets. She was transferred to Montreal with additional managerial responsibilities and her health suffered. Upon the advice of her doctor she moved to Winnipeg and continued secretarial work and volunteering at Holy Trinity Anglican Church. With the minister's encouragement she soon took over volunteering in the inner city of Winnipeg: visiting the jail; helping those released find employment; taking food, clothing, and household articles into the boarding houses and homes of the poor. She worked with the immigrants; set up programs for children to learn personal hygiene; and eventually established the Margaret Scott Nursing Mission which served the nurses of Manitoba and doctors in state of the art community nursing. Scott never remarried; she was self taught and never in 45 years of service did she ask for financial support. Her obituary stated,

The contribution made by Mrs. Scott to public welfare was thus much greater than the present scope of the mission indicates, important although that scope is. A portion of the social welfare work now done by the city might not have been undertaken by the city, had not Mrs. Scott pointed out the need and shown the way. (August 3, 1931, *Winnipeg Free Press*, p. A1)

Margret Jonsdottir Benedictsson was born in Iceland and immigrated with her parents to the Dakota Territory in 1877. By age thirteen, she was an orphan and self sufficient. She attended Bathgate College in the Dakota Territory for two years. She moved to Winnipeg and attended the Winnipeg Central Business College at night. In 1893, she married Sigfrus Benedictsson, a well known publisher. Together they published a women's suffrage journal, *Freyja*. Benedictsson became a well known suffrage speaker and organizer who worked with the Icelandic community and the Unitarian Church in Winnipeg. As a young girl she had read about the plight of women to family violence, high birth rate, poverty and the cause of human rights. She vowed to take up their cause: Margret supported the vote for Manitoba women as well as temperance. Kinnear (1987) reinforces Benedictsson's vision for women:

While never disowning a woman's role as wife and mother, Benedictsson wished to see the woman in the family recognized as an equal partner, as in a business concern. But there was not doubt that she wished to see woman's role expand out of the family and into public life. (p. 26)

This strong outspoken feminist divorced her husband after 18 years of marriage and moved with her two children to Seattle, Washington.

Jessie Isabel (Belle) Grant McDermott was born in Bruce County, Ontario and moved with her parents to a farm at Burnside, Manitoba in 1871. She was one of 11 children. She witnessed many events in rural Manitoba: a treaty signing with local Indians; a prairie fire; building of a homestead; church festivals; life in a one room schoolhouse. McDermott went to the Manitoba Normal School in Winnipeg in 1886 and became a teacher at 16 years of age. She was active in the Presbyterian Church (later, at its creation, she joined the United Church), Mission Bands, and church committees and boards as well as the Children's Aid Society. She and Robert McDermott (a reeve) married in 1900 and she had to stop teaching in accordance with the expectation of the time. She began to write her "personal history" book, *Tales from Bellemeade* (c. 1904). McDermott established many organizations for youth and began a Mission Band in Gladstone, Manitoba after lobbying with the local all male board of trustees. Francis McDermott wrote about her mother's service:

Young people were the apple of her eye. She would give time and effort to all activities concerning young people. She was on the executive of the Portage Presbyterial (1917) and with that backing mother came home from a Presbyterial meeting in Gladstone and began to work. Baby Bands and Mission Bands were in their infancy and mother spent hours on the telephone stirring up interest in Mission Bands. (personal communication, January 24, 2003)

Methodology

This qualitative historical analysis used biographical profiles crafted from primary and secondary sources. Primary sources (located at University of Manitoba, Dafoe Library and Icelandic Library; the Provincial Archives of Manitoba; and the Legislative Library of Manitoba.) included archival sources: newspaper articles (particularly *Manitoba/Winnipeg Free Press*, and *Winnipeg Tribune*), formal obituary notices, committee minutes, autobiographies, letters, and original articles penned by the women.

Secondary sources included articles and books written by historians, journal articles, and texts related to the development of leadership. Varied

excerpts of text were consulted to discover meaning and provide opportunities for the three women to speak for themselves. A “big paper process” was utilized to cluster information into common themes and coded.

Data Analysis

After rereading of each biography several times details and themes within each biography were identified. Patterns were located within the data. Direct interpretation involved ascribed meaning to single instances (e.g. defining moment when woman chose to serve). Thematic analysis was conducted. Generalizations were presented. In essence, 6 steps were included in the study:

- Construction of the lives of 3 women from the primary and secondary sources
- Analysis of the individual life stories for the 10 characteristics of servant-leadership
- Determination of specific similarities in leadership style
- Determination of themes through analysis and comparisons
- Determine commonalities in demographic information
- Determine the lessons learned or natural generalizations

A hard copy of each biography was analyzed for indicators of servant-leadership. These were marked and named by characteristic. Proxies for these characteristics were determined by relating the indicators/characteristics to the incidents or activities outlines for similarities. A summative chart of the characteristics listed under each woman’s name was created (see Table 1 following Limitations).

Limitations

This study was not designed to identify all females that demonstrated servant-leadership in Manitoba. The life stories of three women were constructed although each was not a complete and thorough biography; it provided the essential details of each life in order to answer specific questions. Their life spans overlapped (1870-1930) but they did not match each other exactly in time and location. Hence, they may not have shared all the same life experiences and were at various ages and stages of their lives during that common time period. Information was comprehensive but not exhaustive and there may be much that is still unknown about their life stories.

Major Findings

Table 1
Characteristics of Servant-Leadership

Characteristics	Scott	Benedictsson	McDermott
Listening	X *	X	X
Empathy	X +	X	X
Healing	X +	?	X
Awareness	X +	?	X
Persuasion	X	X +	X
Conceptualization	X	X + *	?
Foresight	X	?	?
Stewardship	X +	X	X + *
Growth of Others	X +	X	X +
Building Community	X +	X	X

Note:

X indicates the presence of evidence of that particular characteristic

+ indicates a particular strength demonstrated in the characteristic(s)

* indicates a particular characteristic(s) that was best exemplified by the woman.

? indicates weak or uncertain evidence of a particular characteristic

Research Questions

The following research questions provided direction to the study and a response to each question follows:

Research Question 1: What information provided in the lives of the three women could be considered as characteristic of servant-leadership, as identified by Robert K. Greenleaf (1970/1991, p. 1-37) or their proxies: (1)

listening, (2) empathy, (3) healing, (4) persuasion, (5) awareness, (6) conceptualization, (7) foresight, (8) commitment to the growth of people, (9) stewardship, and (10) building community? The biographical profile for Scott provided evidence of all ten servant-leadership characteristics. Evidence of the ten characteristics were found in Benedictsson's profile, although the demonstration of healing, foresight, and awareness were somewhat weaker than the other characteristics. Also, McDermott provided evidence of servant-leadership, but the findings for conceptualization and foresight were weak.

Research Question 2: What common traits (distinguishing features) were found between and among the women in terms of their servant-leadership characteristics? There were differences in strengths or abundance of the servant-leadership characteristics. Perhaps a better question to have asked of the data was, "what strengths did each woman express, in terms of servant-leadership?" Scott was relentless in her mission to make inner city Winnipeg a healthier place for children and families. She implemented practical hygiene techniques, was unique and she remained humble in her 45 year stewardship to her death. Benedictsson had greater evidence of persuasion and conceptualization in her work on behalf of women's suffrage and in her writing to promote human justice in *Freyja*. McDermott emphasized stewardship to her community, church and family and commitment to the growth of others in church groups, school, and local organizations.

Research Question 3: Was any servant-leadership characteristic(s), as listed in research question one, demonstrated by only one woman? Given that each woman displayed evidence of all ten characteristics of servant-leadership, perhaps the better question to have asked was "Which characteristic did each woman best exemplify?" Because each woman had her own particular environment, life circumstances, and specific interests, evidence of each servant-leadership characteristic varied according to each profile. Scott provided frequent mention of her strong listening skills. The story of Benedictsson reflects evidence of conceptualization, of having vision and seeing a "big picture" in her mind. McDermott's biographical profile often reflects stewardship to her community through church, social agencies, and community programs.

Research Question 4: Was there evidence in the lives of the three women of a particular theme(s), i.e., a subject or topic on which the women wrote, spoke, or thought? Four themes permeate the lives of the three women:

(1) they all pursued additional education and learning and encouraged others to do so: Scott took secretarial training; read books on healthcare; and established the Mission as a training center for healthcare workers and implemented personal hygiene programs in the Winnipeg schools. Benedictsson attended two business schools; she helped raise tuition funds for girls in her church; she used her magazine *Freyja* to inform others about the fight for human rights. McDermott completed secondary school and attended the normal school in Winnipeg; she home schooled her seriously ill daughter for several months; she established programs for youth in the local area.

(2) Each woman had a strong religious foundation: Scott was an Anglican and practiced her faith in the inner city helping the less fortunate. Benedictsson was a Unitarian and was extremely active in church committee work. McDermott writes of her faith as a young child; she worked relentlessly for the Mission Band program; she was involved in the movement to create the United Church of Canada.

(3) All of the women were enablers of others. Scott helped unemployed men find work in a wood yard she established that was taken over by the city. She assisted the poor and needy by going into their home to help them organize and clean their lodgings and make it healthier for them. McDermott assured children would receive religious training through invitations to others to have Mission Bands and provided debating clubs to enable youngsters to speak and present themselves properly.

(4) A sense of altruism and caring for others was common in their life stories. The responsibility and duty to their fellow human beings (Social Gospel Movement) encouraged Scott to devote forty-five years to healthcare of inner city Winnipeg. Benedictsson never lost sight of the plight of women and continued to write and speak out on the right to vote and working conditions. McDermott created a straw covered floor to protect her daughter who took seizures; she was active in the Children's Aid Society, and the Temperance Movement.

Research Question 5: How was the call to servant-leadership initiated in their lives? Scott provides three incidents whereby she connects with the concept of serving others. As a child she heard about the Muller Orphanage in England from her mother and felt she would like to help the poor and unfortunate (Macvicar, c.1939, p. 6-8) and while living with her aunt she met a child from that orphanage. The Rev. C.C. Owens of her church prayed for her to work with the inner city poor. One evening Scott says she had a calling and believed it was her calling and duty to serve the needy. Benedictsson, as

a young girl in Iceland, read articles and books about oppressed people, unhappily married women, and girls who wanted to break free from parental restrictions (Johnson, 1994, p. 122). She wrote that she was “angry and distressed” at the stories of “oppressed persons, unhappily married women.” She wrote of a “yearning to break down all the fetters that tie the people to evil and distress” (Kinnear, 1982, p. 176). McDermott’s call is less definitive. She was one of 11 children and one wonders if being in a large family provided a comfort level with the idea of serving and helping others? She also wrote in her book *Tales from Bellemeade* (c. 1904) of the prairie fire she witnessed as a small child and the religious fervor of reading the Bible and singing hymns and that the seeds of future labors may have been planted at that time. As well, McDermott became a classroom teacher at the age of 16 years and began formal service to children.

Research Question 6: What were the most common demographic characteristics e.g., marital status, age, ethnic origin, residence, education, religion, and community life that were shared by these women? First, they were all immigrants to the Province of Manitoba. Scott came to Manitoba from Ontario (with a brief period in Montreal) as a young widow to work as an office secretary. Benedictsson moved from Iceland to North Dakota then to Manitoba as a girl. McDermott emigrated with her family from Ontario to Manitoba as a very small child. Scott and McDermott were of British ancestry.

Second, as mentioned earlier, they were all strong active “church goers”- Scott was an Anglican; Benedictsson, a Unitarian; and McDermott was a Presbyterian and later when it was created, a member of the United Church of Canada.

Third, all three went on to further public education or formal business training. Scott took secretarial training in Montreal and learned shorthand in Winnipeg. Benedictsson went to Bathgate College in North Dakota and the Winnipeg Business School. McDermott went to the Manitoba Normal School in Winnipeg after high school.

Fourth, all three were married at some point in their lives. Scott married early in her twenties and was widowed (without children) by the age of 25 years and never remarried. Benedictsson married in 1892 at the age of 26 and she divorced her husband Sigfrus eighteen years later after having two children. McDermott married at age 30 years (1900) and remained married for nearly 44 years until she was widowed, approximately a year before her death.

Fifth, all three women actually lived sometime in the City of Winnipeg. Scott lived in the city the whole time she resided in Manitoba. Benedictsson lived in Gimli, Winnipeg, and Selkirk and moved back to Winnipeg. McDermott lived most of her life in rural Manitoba, around Portage la Prairie area, but she did live in the City of Winnipeg while she attended the Manitoba Normal School.

The sixth and last common demographic was related to their life spans. All three lived into old age: Scott (1855-1931) lived just over 75 years; Benedictsson (1866-1956) lived to be 90 years; and McDermott (1870-1950) lived to 80 years of age.

Conclusions

The crafted narratives of the three Manitoba pioneer women, Scott, Benedictsson, and McDermott provided evidence of all ten characteristics of servant-leadership: listening, empathy, healing, persuasion, awareness, conceptualization, foresight, commitment to the growth of people, stewardship, and building community. Some characteristics appeared in greater strength or abundance in each of the women. Scott was particularly strong in each of the ten areas. Some characteristics appeared more frequently depending on the woman and her life profile. Benedictsson's biographical profile illustrated frequent examples of conceptualization and vision in the areas of women's rights and the vote although McDermott's foresight and conceptualization were questionable. It may be concluded that servant-leadership characteristics were present in the stories of all three women.

Thematically, they all thought, spoke, wrote, or were involved in learning; their strong religious foundation provided guidance throughout their long lives. They encouraged others through their actions and example (Scott and McDermott). They enabled others through lectures and publications (Benedictsson). The strongest theme, altruism or caring for others was clear in the ongoing service performed by these women to their communities, in various social organizations and their churches.

As well, the women had at least 6 common demographic characteristics among them: immigrant background; active church membership; educational improvement; were married; resided sometime in the City of Winnipeg; and lived into old age.

Implications

The cultural expectation for middle-class women (1870-1930) was one of maintaining the home, bearing children, and supporting a spouse as he earned

a living. A woman could serve outside the home, in the church as a missionary, as a nurse to the sick, as a volunteer with the poor and needy, or as an unmarried classroom teacher. Some women worked in stores as clerks and in offices as secretaries. Each of the three women followed unique paths to service. Scott followed a path that included secretary, church and outreach volunteer, healthcare worker, manager, and leader of the Margaret Scott Mission. Her undertaking was to serve the poor, sick, and needy, even though she did not have formal training as a nurse. Scott used her office and secretarial skills to manage the business affairs of the Mission and carried out the life of her church through her outreach to the Winnipeg community.

Benedictsson utilized her office and secretarial skills while running the publishing business with her husband. She helped create the suffrage publication, *Freyja*. She served and led committees in the Unitarian church and Icelandic community; spoke/wrote on human rights issues, including opportunities for women, and became leader of the suffrage movement in the Manitoba Icelandic community.

McDermott started as a classroom teacher who used her educational training to organize opportunities for children and youth in the Portage la Prairie area. She was an active church member and leader on committees and boards and as a child welfare and community activist.

Although these pioneer women lived in the latter part of the 1800s, Robert K. Greenleaf wrote about these characteristics in the 1960s, and finally formulated them into a model of leadership, which he termed servant-leadership. The research results imply that it was possible for pioneer women to demonstrate leadership in their society, but they did so by fulfilling a different and unrecognized model, one that is now called servant-leadership. Women do lead despite their circumstances, and they probably always have, except we did not have the language of servant-leadership to put their acts into this particular framework.

Each of the pioneer women was an educator (not always in a formalized school sense) and involved in a teaching-learning process. Analysis of present day school leadership may reveal the existence of servant-leadership within faculties and with student "servant-leaders" in the classroom. Owens (1995/2001) states, "The transformational leader is well aware that leadership involves not command and coercion, but encouraging the constant growth and development of followers. It is a teaching-learning process" (p. 257). This is in harmony with Greenleaf. The writer is comfortable with stating that servant-leadership is transformational.

Feminist theorists, including Gilligan (1982) and Rosener (1990), suggest women may have a different way of leading than the "traditional

command and control leadership style” (Owens, 1995/2001, p. 256). Rosener’s research suggested participative, empowering, caring, transformational leadership was related to many females but, not exclusively. Thus, the examination of successful organizational structures may reveal a model, although not formalized, that is reflective of servant-leadership and promises an ongoing process of growth and development- a transformation- that was encouraged by Greenleaf. This approach may become the leadership paradigm for the 21st century.

Recommendations

Russell (1995) wrote of the importance of recording pioneer women’s stories as connection to present day working environments, “The survival strategies which have worked for them are ones which may well help other women trying to navigate the often confusing world of organizations” (p. 127). And Heilbrun (2002) writes to encourage women to continue to tell their stories so that we may hear their voices and give them recognition in their own right. In response to the observations made by Manitoba historian, Gerald Friesen (1996, p. 204), it is time for a comprehensive history of women in Manitoba to be written. Departments of Educational Administration need to include the model of servant-leadership in their courses of study. Research into the perceptions of undergraduate and graduate students of Educational Administration toward the concept of servant-leadership warrants investigation. Lastly, the writer agrees and supports the recommendation for collaborative research between and among other faculties with those in Educational Administration. Young and Levin (2002) state, “It is also important to keep in mind that as education is increasingly interconnected with other policy fields, research in such areas as economics, child development, community health, and families may have important implications for schooling and teaching” (p. xvii).

Final Thoughts

A servant-leader begins with a feeling that one wants to serve and then with deliberate choice, the desire to lead evolves. Greenleaf (1970/1991, p. 7) poses the ultimate question: “Do those served grow as persons; do they while being served, become healthier, wiser, freer, more autonomous? And what of the least privileged in society: will they benefit, or at least not be further deprived?” I believe the three women in the study would respond positively to Greenleaf’s question. They were servants first, then leaders, and with strength and endurance survived, despite a range of problems. It was through their service to Manitoba communities that these three women servant-

leaders acted as catalysts for change. Indeed, their stories support Healy's (1923, p. 260) opinion, that if told, they would provide interest and inspiration for future generations.

References

- Benefactress dead: Death calls friend of poor and needy. (1931, August 3). *The Winnipeg Free Press*, A1, A2.
- Bennis, W. (1997). *Managing people is like herding cats* (pp. 104-105). Provo, UT: Executive Excellence.
- Block, P. (1993). *Stewardship: Choosing service over self-interest* (pp. xx, 6-25). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Bruno- Jofre, R. (Ed.). (1993). *Issues in the history of education in Manitoba: From the construction of the common school to the politics of voices*. Queenston, Ontario: Edwin Mellen.
- Correspondence samples. Margaret Scott. *Provincial Archives of Manitoba*. MG10 B9, 3, 11, 17, 24-25, 53-54, 73-76.
- De Pree, M. (1989). *Leadership is an art* (p. 145). New York: Dell.
- DeGraves, D. (2000). Margaret Scott. In C. Armstrong, (Ed.), *Extraordinary ordinary women: Manitoba women and their stories* (pp. 65-66, 93-94). Winnipeg: Manitoba Clubs of the Canadian Federation of University Women.
- Foster, J. (n.d.). *United Church youth groups*. In *Gladstone then & now: 1871-2001* (p. 136). Altona, Manitoba: Friesen, History Book Division.
- Friesen, G. (1987). *The Canadian prairies: A history* (pp. 45-204). University of Toronto Press.
- Friesen, G. (1996). *River road: Essays on Manitoba and prairie history* (p. 204). Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Greenleaf, R. (1976). *The institution as servant* (pp. 1-16). Indianapolis: The Robert K. Greenleaf Center.
- Greenleaf, R. (1970/1991). *The servant as leader* (pp. 1-37). Indianapolis: The Robert K. Greenleaf Center.
- Healy, W. (1923). *Women of Red River: Being a book written from the recollections of women surviving from the Red River era* (pp. 1-23, 260). Winnipeg: Peguis.
- Heilbrun, C. (2002). *Writing a woman's life* (pp. 17-25, 44-46, 121). New York: Ballantine.
- Helgesen, S. (1990). *The female advantage: Women's ways of leadership*. New York: Doubleday.
- Johnson, S. (1994, Spring). *Margret Benedictsson, Freyja and the struggle for woman's equality* (pp. 117-127). *The Icelandic Canadian*.
- Kinnear, M. (1982). *Daughters of time: Women in the western tradition* (pp. 175-176). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Kinnear, M. (1987). The Icelandic connection: Freyja and the Manitoba woman suffrage movement. *Canadian Woman Studies*, 7(4), 25-28.
- Kinnear, M. (1998). *A female economy: Women's work in a prairie province 1870-1970* (pp. xii, 5-31, 52-63). Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press.
- Macvicar, H. (c. 1939). Margaret Scott: A tribute (pp. 6-8). The Margaret Scott Nursing Mission.
- Margaret Scott, city's angel of mercy, dies after lingering illness. (1931, Aug. 3). *The Winnipeg Tribune*, p. 1, 14.
- McDermott, I. (c. 1904). *Tales from Bellemeade* (p. xiii). Portage la Prairie: Self Published.
- Owens, R. (1995/2001). *Organizational behavior in education* (7th ed, pp. 237-262). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Prentice, A., Bourne, P., Brandt, G., Light, B., Mitchison, W., & Black, N. (1996). *Canadian women: A history* (2nd ed., pp. 74-176, 190-236). Toronto, Ontario: Harcourt Brace.
- Rosener, J. (1990). The ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review*. 68(6), 119-125.

- Russell, R. (1995). Learning from survivors: Women leaders who have stayed the course share their stories. In C. Reynolds & B. Young (Eds.), *Women and leadership in Canadian education* (pp. 127-142). Calgary: Detsilig Enterprises.
- Shack, S. (1993). The making of a teacher (1917-1935): One woman's perspective. In R. Bruno-Jofre (Ed.), *Issues in the history of education in Manitoba* (pp. 431-469). Queenston, Ontario: Edwin Mellen.
- Shakeshaft, C. (1987). *Women in educational administration*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Shirriff, W. (2000). Jessie Isabel McDermott. In C. Armstrong (Ed.), *Extraordinary ordinary women: Manitoba women and their stories* (pp. 5-6, 86). Winnipeg: Manitoba Clubs of the Canadian Federation of University Women.
- Thor, J. (2002). *Icelanders in North America: The first settlers* (pp. 85-86, 185, 260-261). Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.
- Treble, A. (2000). Margret J. Benedictsson. In C. Armstrong (Ed.), *Extraordinary ordinary women: Manitoba women and their stories* (pp. 77-78-94-95). Winnipeg: Manitoba Clubs of the Canadian Federation of University Women.
- Wolf, K. (Ed.). (1996). *Writings by western Icelandic women* (pp. 5-14, 20-38, 73-85). Winnipeg: The University of Manitoba Press.
- Young, J., & Levin, B. (2002). *Understanding Canadian schools: An introduction to educational administration* (3rd ed., p. xvii). Scarborough, Ontario: Thomson Nelson.

Book Review

Amy Lee Andreassen

PLAY LIKE A MAN, WIN LIKE A WOMAN: WHAT MEN KNOW ABOUT SUCCESS THAT WOMEN NEED TO LEARN.

by Gail Evans. New York: Broadway Books.

Introduction

Success: The achievement of something desired, planned, or attempted: attributed their success in business to hard work. (American Heritage Dictionary, 2000)

Gail Evans began her career working on a number of congressional staffs during the 1960s. In 1970, she was a founding partner of Global Research Services, a research and marketing firm based in Atlanta. She began working for CNN at its inception in 1980, and in 1996 she was promoted to Executive Vice President. She later was named to Executive Vice President of Domestic Networks for the CNN Newsgroup in September 2000 (Program Resources).

When you read this first book by Gail Evans, you realize why she succeeded at becoming the first female executive vice president at CNN. Evans uses an easy style, a quick wit, and a “to-the-point” manner to set forth a foundation for women leaders.

In her book, Evans, now retired, attempted to define the “unwritten rules” in business. Her premise is that to get ahead in today’s corporate environment, women need to understand and “play” by the rules written by men. Evans believes in the bottom line, “When it comes to business, most women are at a disadvantage. We’re forced to guess, to improvise, to bluff. That is why so few of us play the game well, and even fewer find it fulfilling” (p. 7).

Gender differences in leadership style have been the focus of recent studies. Whether in the business field or in an educational setting, gender does play a role in leadership. Daily and Dalton (2003) stated that it is imperative to have gender diversification in corporations. They wrote,

About the Author

Amy Lee Andreassen started her teaching career in San Antonio, Texas, where she worked primarily with minority, English language learners in the elementary grades. While in San Antonio, Andreassen received her Masters in Educational Administration from Trinity University.

After relocating with her family to North English, Iowa, she served as Director of Curriculum and Instruction for two rural school districts.

She served on the board, and as president-elect of Iowa Women in Educational Leadership (IWEL). In addition, she has served on various committees for School Administrators of Iowa (SAI). Andreassen is currently an elementary principal at English Valleys Elementary in North English and is active in community and school affairs. She is working on her Ed.D. in Educational Leadership.

Do women add unique value to the boardroom? Absolutely. They provide unique perspectives, experiences, and work styles as compared to their male counterparts. The addition of women to the boardroom, for example, can greatly enhance the board's deliberations. Women's communication styles tend to be more participative and process-oriented. These stylistic differences may enhance directors' decision-making processes by encouraging the board to consider a wider range of strategic options.

Overview

There is much research to support the issue of masculine versus feminine leadership styles (Collingwood, 1995; Gardiner & Tiggemann, 1999; Helgesen, 1990). Evans' book serves as a platform to teach women how to build upon their strengths enhancing their feminine side while learning to employ masculine techniques as well.

Evans identified four rules that women need to understand to be successful in the workplace.

You Are Who You Say You Are

Rule number one is You are Who You Say You Are. This rule urges women to take charge of their own destinies. Evans writes, "As I see it, women have two options: to structure our world around our own choices, or to let

someone else make the choices for us” (p. 21). She points to many women who fall into the trap of being victimized. The women see themselves as victims (to their husbands, to their children, to their bosses) so much in fact that it is a self-fulfilling prophecy. Evans urges professional women to set their own goals and then to do everything possible to reach those goals.

One Prize Doesn't Fit All

Rule two is One Prize Doesn't Fit All. This rule examines the role of fulfillment in the workplace. Evans relates several stories concerning the decisions men and women make when entering the job market. Men have a tendency to move up the corporate ladder at a faster pace than women. She wrote,

We women are much more likely to find an area in our company that we find fascinating and remain there for years. We tend to ignore the stars, bells, and brass rings that men consider necessary markers of success. For us, the ultimate reward can simply be the ability to say: I feel great about what I'm doing. (p.24)

She continued, “When we choose to fulfill ourselves by what we do, rather than only what we make, we're not playing the game the way the guys are playing it. They are much more likely to be thinking about material success or power than fulfillment” (p. 25). Robison and Lipman-Blumen (2003), found significant gender differences on competition with men reporting higher scores than women (2003). Competition can be a leading factor in workplace achievement. When men negotiate to start at a higher pay at the beginning of their careers, the gap between male and female salaries is difficult to overcome.

Work Isn't A Sorority

For rule number three, Evans focuses on workplace relationships. She wrote,

Women enter the job arena with a stronger urge to form and maintain relationships than men do. Whether we are talking to the dry cleaner, the cashier, or the boss, we want to know a life story, we want to exchange feelings, we want to turn the other person into just that, a person, rather than the other party in a business transaction. (p. 26)

She then contrasted this need to build relationships with the male view of not personalizing their interactions with others. She advised, “The people you meet in business can be nice acquaintances, individuals you can have a good working relationship with, but the key word is “working” (p.28). Women

need to understand that highly visible emotions are not desired in the workplace setting. Personal relationships do not need to be built in order to have a successful working partnership.

You're Always a Mother, Daughter, Wife, or Mistress

Rule four follows. Women succumb to role-playing when dealing with men who tend to pigeonhole women into four categories: mother, daughter, wife or mistress.

When the time comes for that young boy who is now a man to mix with the opposite sex at the office, he is often at a loss. And when in doubt, he – like most people – stereotypes. Thus he tends to think of a woman co-worker as his mother, his daughter, his wife, or his mistress – even when she is very clearly none of the above. Knowing this will help you understand male behavior patterns. (p. 30)

Evans cautions women about falling into these roles in the workplace environment, and she gives strategies to help meet male counterparts on an even level.

Discussion

Evans provided a dialogue on how to “play” the game. She relied on the premise that men make the rules and therefore have a marked advantage in the business world. Women take a critical assessment of actions and choose to embrace feminine leadership skills while building upon the positive male leadership skills, a better chance of success in the corporate world. This same lesson can be applied to an institutional setting such as a public school district.

Another new book, whose author maintained a similar viewpoint to Evans, is *Nice Girls Don't Get the Corner Office* (2004) by Lois P. Frankel. Frankel, like Evans, stated that gender differences in the workplace can lead to corporate ruin unless women undertake a separate set of workplace behaviors. Once again, the focus is on eliminating unconscious mistakes that sabotage women's careers. Frankel wrote

The workplace is exactly that – a game. It has rules, boundaries, winners, and losers. Women tend to approach work more like an event (picnic, concert, fund-raiser) where everyone comes together for the day to play together nicely. In our desire to create win-win situations, we unknowingly create win-lose ones – where we're the losers. Playing the game of business doesn't mean you're out to cause others to fail, but it is competitive. It

means you are aware of the rules and develop strategies for making them work to your advantage. (p. 20)

Both of these books offer an interesting perspective on gender issues in the workplace. Those interested in the role that gender plays in forming leadership capacity will find Evans' book an interesting resource. Even though the book strays from the academic path to become more of a "beachside top ten list" read, the insight that Evans provides is invaluable. The topic of diversification whether it be by race, ethnicity, or gender, is important for all leaders to understand. Evans shares her wealth of knowledge through *Play Like A Man, Win Like A Woman: What men know about success that women need to learn*.

References

- The American heritage dictionary of the English language* (4th ed.). (2000). Houghton Mifflin.
- Chusmir, L. H., Koberg, C. S., & Mills, J. (1989). Male/female differences in the association of managerial style and personal values. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 129(1), 65-78.
- Collingwood, H. (1995, November). Women as managers: not just different – better. *Working Women*, 14.
- Daily, C. M., & Dalton, D. R. (2003). Women in the boardroom: A business imperative. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 24(5), 8-9.
- Evans, G. (2000). *Play like a man, win like a woman: What men know about success that women need to learn*. New York: Broadway.
- Frankel, L. (2004). *Nice girls don't get the corner office: 101 unconscious mistakes women make that sabotage their careers*. Boston: Warner.
- Gardiner, M., & Tiggemann, M. (1999). Gender differences in leadership style, job stress and mental health in male- and female-dominated industries. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 72(3), 301-315.
- Greenwald, J. (2004). Working mother wins gender bias ruling. *Business Insurance*, 38(17), 4-6.
- Helgesen, S. (1990). *The female advantage: Women's ways of leadership*. New York: Doubleday/Currency.
- Program Resources. (n.d.). *Professional speakers*. Retrieved Jun 2, 2004, from Program Resources Web site: www.programresources.com
- Robinson, J. L., & Lipman-Blumen, J. (2003). Leadership behavior of male and female managers, 1984-2002. *Journal of Education for Business*, 28-33.

VOICES OF WOMEN IN THE FIELD

S is for Survival: Tips for Surviving Administrative Change

Harriet Gould

Women educators work in a variety of leadership roles. The roles vary from principal, to staff developer, to central office personnel. As women, they bring unique qualities to their positions. When change occurs in the superintendent position, a leadership style change often follows. Women need to adapt to this change although often the change can be difficult. Just like the kindergarten student who must learn the alphabet code to master language skills, the female leader often must learn new skills to work effectively with the new superintendent.

Superintendent tenure averages about five years in any district. With frequent turnover, most women leaders encounter many administrative changes during their careers. As the new *super* begins leading the district, stress, tension and even anger can develop. Team dynamics may fall apart or never develop. If this is the direction your administrative relationship is headed, these alphabet tips may be a helpful resource for survival.

A – Attitude: Choose your attitude. Keep it positive and upbeat. When leaders whine and complain, productivity decreases. Adopt a school mission that supports this. Check out FISH! A Remarkable Way to Boost Morale and Improve Results by Lundin, Paul and Christensen. Positive attitudes improve the climate everywhere and work becomes much more enjoyable for all.

B – Be there: When change rocks the boat, it is important to *be there* for your colleagues and staff. Acknowledge their accomplishments, listen to their concerns and support their ideas. This will help calm the waters and make the boat ride smoother. Be there for them.

C – Communicate: Effective communication is essential for success. Be clear and specific. When things are not clear, seek clarity through questioning. *In your face* confrontation may not be the wisest way to question. Smile and say, “help me understand this a little better.” Or ask, “could you restate this in a different way?” Perhaps you could restate the topic by saying, “let me tell you what I think I heard.....Is this correct?” When communication

About the Author

Harriet Gould is an elementary principal/K-12 curriculum director at Raymond Central Schools, where her two elementary buildings are 10 miles apart. Harriet is well known by her colleagues as an innovative leader. She is past president of the Phi Delta Kappa Chapter. She has taught at Creighton University and the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. Her dissertation, *The History of Nebraska Public School Finance Law*, was a Morphet Award winner in 1999. In her spare time she enjoys reading, swimming, and cooking for the family run bed and breakfast.

barriers exist, frustration results. Do everything possible to keep the lines of communication open and flowing.

D – Decision making model: Discover the decision making model used by the new boss. Is input important or not? Is there an informal model as well as a formal decision making structure in place? Is consensus used? Understanding how decisions are to be made will reduce stress.

E – Evaluate leadership styles: There are many leadership styles. Study her/his style. Is it compatible with how you operate? If not, what do you need to do to co-exist? Take the *Myers-Briggs Type Indicator* or another self-assessment and share results with the administrative team. Evaluating leadership styles should be a priority.

F – FUN: Have fun in your job. Even if you're bucking heads with a bozo leader, fun is an essential ingredient in your work. The fun may be spontaneous or planned. Try a game of ruler tag, a crazy scarf or hat day, or even a backward clothes day. Putting fun in the school day re-energizes all.

G – Giggle: Laughter is important to living a healthy lifestyle and surviving change. Sponsor a comedian to come to a faculty meeting, find a place where "The Joke of the Day" can be posted, or share funny emails. Giggling isn't just for little girls; women need it too.

H – Heart: You gotta have heart. Caring about what happens in the personal lives of your staff is very important. Take time to visit with colleagues on a personal level about their families, interests and hobbies. Your caring and concern about their lives outside of school shows you have heart!

I – Innovate: Be willing to take risks and try different things. When you focus your energy on new projects, like starting a Children's Classics Reading Class or implementing *Brain Gym* moves, positive energy abounds. Creativity and innovation redirects stress into positive thinking.

J – Journal: Begin each day with writing. Give yourself an extra 30 minutes each morning to free write at least three pages. You won't believe how powerful this activity is for coping with stress and change. If you need guidance, use The Artist's Way by Julia Cameron as a companion for study and reflection. If you haven't done this, make it a priority. You'll be amazed at the results.

K – Knowledge: There is so much to know. The more you know, the more you know you don't know. Read journals, read research, read electronic newsletters like "ASCD SmartBrief" (ascd@smartbrief.com) and "PEN Weekly NewsBlast" (newsblast@lyris.publiceducation.org). *Phi Delta Kappan* and *Educational Leadership* are two excellent journals to peruse. Continue building your knowledge base. Smart women are powerful.

L – Learning: Life long learning is the expectation for school. As a leader, it is important to model this. Take classes, work on your doctorate, attend seminars, and create learning communities. Try using Marzano's text, *Instruction that Works* and form study teams. By challenging your thinking collectively, improved student learning will result. Women are learners. Just do it!

M – Mission: Schools have mission statements to guide the direction of the school. Is the mission being followed? When administrative changes happen, revisit the mission of the school to ensure continued buy in from all stakeholders. Effective schools follow their mission.

N – Never say never: Keep options open. Don't back yourself in the corner or put yourself in a box. You may find yourself sitting in the corner with a dunce hat on or you may find yourself with the box lid on floating down the river. By keeping options open, decisions – even the most difficult ones – may be easier to make.

O – Optimistic: Optimism helps create a positive culture. Like the Little Engine, say "I think I can, I think I can, I know I can." It may seem simplistic

or trite, but believe that it can happen. When working in a dysfunctional workplace, sometimes a daily mantra of optimistic sayings is helpful.

P – Pick your battles: If clashes are numerous, pick your battles. If you battle on all issues, get ready to pack your bags. You'll be exhausted and stressed to the max. It is important to stand up for moral and ethical causes. Sometimes it is necessary to just "let go" of an issue. Happiness might not be the outcome, but perhaps a compromise can be reached. By picking the most important causes, energy saved from trivial disagreements will help sustain the fight. Stand up for what is right for children and learning.

Q - Question: It is important to ask "why" when decisions are made without input. When some rationale is given it helps one to better understand the decision. Question the emotional price you're paying in your job. Is it worth it? Is there balance in your life? Family, job, spiritual life, mental health, fitness, finances - what does your life circle look like? Is there balance?

R – Reflect: Reflection is a priority. There are a variety of ways to reflect – journaling, meditating, praying, walking, swimming, and listening to music. It is critical to take time to reflect and assess personal situations. Talking with a friend can help too. Reflective women will bring renewed energy to the workforce.

S – Survive: When a new superintendent comes on board, survival is the key!

T – Time: Make time for yourself. When stress and job pressures increase, it is important to schedule time for you. Join a fitness club, take yourself out on a special date, listen to your favorite music. Also, take professional time to attend a conference or seminar. Write these personal time appointments in your calendar. If you don't schedule it, it won't happen.

U – Understand differences: Women leaders, like men, have strengths and weaknesses. Remember that men are from Mars and women are from Venus. Take time to discover your strengths and weaknesses as well as those of the new leaders. Understand that differences can complement the organization.

V – Vision: Follow the vision. Define it, know it, make decisions keeping the vision at the forefront. Visionary leaders are difference makers. Strive for this by having retreats and discussing the future. Where are we headed? Ask, "what's next and how?" Vision is similar to glue; it holds the group together. Know it and share it with all stakeholders.

W – Work ethic: Of course women work hard; but, it is often difficult to balance all the obligations placed on women leaders. Take time to chart what your day looks like. Where can you still find time to do a little more planning or filing? Hard work is a key to success; but, balance is important too. Do what you say you're going to do. This helps build trust, a critical element in surviving administrative change.

X – X-ray vision: Be able to see through things. If a new plan or idea is suggested, be able to think with the end in mind. Like the x-ray machine that examines a broken bone, look at the many parts of an issue and determine how to proceed. Share the x-ray with others. Seek advice and input. Develop a plan.

Y – Yellow: Be cautious. The yellow flashing light reminds us to slow down and proceed cautiously. New ideas and plans need time to percolate. Faster isn't always the best way to go. When making a change, remember that an implementation dip will result. Move slowly to assure survival.

Z – Zapped: Follow the tips so you don't get zapped!