

4-2004

The Changing Face of Higher Education: Why More Administrators are Wearing Lipstick

Barbara R. Jones

Louisiana Delta Community College, brjones@southark.edu

Ronda O. Credille

Sourthwest University in Bolivar, MO

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](#)

Jones, Barbara R. and Credille, Ronda O., "The Changing Face of Higher Education: Why More Administrators are Wearing Lipstick" (2004). *Journal of Women in Educational Leadership*. 116.

<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/jwel/116>

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.

The Changing Face of Higher Education: Why More Administrators are Wearing Lipstick

Barbara R. Jones & Ronda O. Credille

During the 150 years women have participated in higher education, they have made tremendous strides. At many postsecondary institutions, women were not accepted as students until the second half of the 20th century. In 2004, women serve in the upper echelons of power at some of the nation's oldest and most prestigious universities. This inquiry examines the history of women's participation in higher education, including their entry into leadership positions within the academy and the barriers and facilitators they experienced. The leadership models and the career development of women are also examined. The results of interviews with eight women administrators at postsecondary institutions in different states are discussed and compared. Challenges women face in the areas of socialization, leadership, and work-life balance are considered. The experiences and insights of women who have achieved leadership posts are also reviewed. Strategies and recommendations for women preparing to pursue higher education leadership positions are provided.

Women have been striving for equality in business, education, politics, society, and life for generations. The roles of women have expanded. Education and training have opened the door to numerous career fields. Although women have experienced significant gains in the workforce, they continue to face barriers and obstacles to advancement in management. In like manner, women in higher education have also experienced impediments to employment and advancement opportunities.

This inquiry examines the history of women's participation in higher education, including their entry into leadership positions within the academy and the barriers and facilitators they experienced. The leadership models and

About the Author

Barbara R. Jones is the Dean of Arts and Sciences and Associate Professor at Louisiana Delta Community College in Monroe, Louisiana.

Ronda O. Credille is an assistant professor of Business Administration at Southwest Baptist University in Bolivar, Missouri.

the career development of women are also examined. The study includes interviews with eight women administrators at postsecondary institutions in different states. Their responses to a specific set of questions are discussed and compared.

Women continue to face challenges in the areas of socialization, leadership, and work-life balance. Despite the many obstacles in their paths, an increasing number of women are earning positions at or near the pinnacle of their institutions. The experiences and insights that these women have gleaned as they have risen to various leadership posts may benefit their colleagues who have similar talents and aspirations. One way to foster the continued increase in women in higher education leadership positions is to motivate female academicians to prepare themselves for and then pursue such positions.

Review of the Literature

Historical Background

Higher education for women has only been available for about 150 years. Prior to the mid-1800s, higher education was available only to men. At the turn of the 20th century, most of the colleges that admitted women were single-sex institutions. As the 20th century progressed, more colleges opened to women, and more women attended college. Traditionally male-only colleges began opening enrollment to women in the 1950s and 1960s (Chamberlain, 1988).

In the early part of the 20th century, women who attended college commonly completed programs in teaching, nursing, or secretarial training (Hanmer, 1996). Through the 1960s, women majored primarily in service-oriented fields such as psychology, sociology, education, home economics, library science, or social work. Men dominated the fields of business,

medicine, law, political science, and economics. The proportion of bachelor or professional degrees awarded to women varied throughout the first half of the century from a low of 19% in 1900, to a high of 41% in 1940, and back down again to 24% in 1950 (Chamberlain, 1988). Educational opportunities for women increased significantly during the 1960s and 1970s. By the late 1980s, however, women represented the majority of students who enrolled in higher education. The number of women enrolled in graduate schools has exceeded the number of men since 1984 (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2001). In 1986, women earned 56% of associate degrees, 51% of bachelor's degrees, 50% of master's degrees, and 35% of doctorates (Touchton & Davis, 1991). By 1999, these percentages had shifted further in favor of women, who earned 60% of the associate degrees, 57% of the bachelor's degrees, 58% of the master's degrees and 44% of the doctor's degrees (NCES, 2001).

The 1960s brought rapid and significant social and legal changes. Major legislation that significantly impacted the social, economic and political opportunities for minorities and women included the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Education Amendments of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (which passed in 1972), and the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1988. Title IX of the Civil Rights Act prohibited discrimination based on sex in educational institutions (Chamberlain, 1988; Hanmer, 1996).

Women in Higher Education

The number of women faculty in higher education institutions has grown during the past 100 years. Women comprised about 20% of the college faculty at the turn of the 20th century (Chamberlain, 1988). Milem and Astin (1993) reported that women faculty in all institutional types increased by seven percentage points between 1972 (21%) and 1989 (28%). At this rate of increase, women faculty will not comprise 50% of the faculty in all institution types until 2042. A review of institution types revealed that women have seen increases of 9% in public four-year institutions, 3% in private four-year institutions, and 14% in public two-year institutions. Chamberlain (1988) noted that women faculty are more abundant at lower ranks and at less prestigious institutions. Milem and Astin (1993) affirmed that women are not as well represented at each rank, but have shown gains since 1972. Touchton and Davis (1991) reported that the proportion of women faculty at the rank of assistant professor has experienced the most significant gain: from 24% in 1972 to 38% in 1985. They also stated that women are tenured at lower rates than men. Hensel (1991) noted that although doctoral program enrollments are declining, the

percentages of women earning doctorates have increased from 11% in 1965 to 36% in 1988. By 1999, women earned 44% of the doctor's degrees awarded in the United States (NCES, 2001). Despite this encouraging finding, women faculty are not hired at a proportionate rate. Hensel (1991) noted out that with a pending faculty shortage, higher education should increase the hiring of women and minorities to solve both faculty shortages and diversity issues. Hensel's findings also indicated that women in higher education experience greater attrition and slower career mobility.

Leadership positions. Although women have gradually progressed into higher education leadership positions, men continue their domination of the academy in terms of policies, evaluations, interactions, practices, and management (Hensel, 1991). Chamberlain (1988) reported that women have infrequently held important positions in higher education administration, with the exception at women's colleges. She stated that the typical positions held by women were dean or director of: women, library services, home economics, or nursing. Touchton and Davis (1991) noted that in 1985, 35% of executives, managers, or administrators in higher education institutions were women. Their 1991 report stated that women tend to be administrators in student affairs or external affairs as opposed to academic or administrative areas. In 1995, the American Council on Education, however, reported that the number of women chief executive officers (CEO) on higher education campuses more than tripled from 5% in 1975 to 16% in 1995. The greatest proportion of women CEOs was found in 2-year independent institutions (27%).

Hiring and compensation. Gender equity continues to be a concern, especially in the areas of hiring and compensation. Moses' (1997) review of the 1997 salary data released by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) revealed that pay inequities persisted for women in academe almost 30 years after the passage of the Equal Pay Act of 1963. Moses further indicated that, based on rank and academic discipline, women continue to earn 4 to 15% less than men do. Smallwood (2001) reported that a committee at the University of Maine, which examined the salaries of professors at seven campuses, found inequities between the salaries of male and female professors. The committee used statistical analysis considering longevity, rank, discipline, and academic degree to determine that 199 of 451 female professors were underpaid by an average of two percent or more. During the course of a career, even a small discrepancy in pay can have significant consequences. According to a study conducted at the State University of New York, a \$1,000 difference in annual salary, based on a modest 3.5% cost-of-living adjustment adds up

to a difference of more than \$84,000 in 40 years (Moses, 1997). When a nominal 5% rate of return is applied to this amount, the disparity grows to more than \$210,000.

For most positions in higher education administration, women earn less than men in similar posts (Touchton & Davis, 1991). Moses (1997) stated that the pay inequities for academic administrators are generally greater than for faculty. The Women in Higher Education website lists the "Gender Differences in 1998-1999 Administrative Salaries" as determined by the College and University Personnel Association (CUPA) annual survey. Fifty-three administrative position salaries are listed by gender and type of institution in the survey report. The salaries of women exceeded men in only 28 of the 212 salaries listed (13%). Touchton and Davis (1991) and the 1998-1999 CUPA survey disclosed that the median salaries for chief academic officers are almost the same at all types of public institutions. The greatest disparities were in the positions of Chief Executive Officer, Assistant to the President, Executive Vice President, Chief Business Officer, and Deans at doctoral, comprehensive, and baccalaureate four-year institutions.

Milem and Astin's (1993) examination of trends in faculty hiring and rank by gender, race and institutional type from 1972 and 1989 revealed a significant increase in newly hired women faculty: from 20.5% in 1972 to 38.6% in 1989. Their research also indicated an increase in women full professors from 9.2% to 14%, with the most significant increases found at associate professor (7.2%) and assistant professor (11.5%) levels. The increased level of assistant professors may reflect the significant increase in newly hired women faculty. Condoleezza Rice, the National Security Director for the Bush administration and a former Stanford provost, has compared this situation to a pyramid (Lively, 2000). An increased number of women in the academic pipeline will result in a larger pool of potential candidates for future upper-level administrative positions. Evidence of the fulfillment of Rice's prediction can be seen on the campuses of major universities. As of July 2000, four of the eight Ivy League institutions had women in the position of provost (Lively, 2000). This trend may be the precursor to a greater number of women CEOs. Nancy Cantor, Provost at the University of Michigan, has said with regard to her duties, "everything in the institution at some time walks through these offices" (Lively, 2000). Kuhnle estimated that once a woman has served three years as a provost without initiating a serious controversy, she is poised for consideration in presidential searches (Lively, 2000).

Blum (1991) reported that in the 1990s, institutions were again appointing special committees and panels to assess the employment situation for women because many equity issues identified in the 1960s and 1970s had yet to be resolved. Blum indicated that one university system was examining hiring and retention statistics for female and minority faculty. Although the institution had hired a large number of women faculty members in a nine-year period, 75% of this number left the system during the same timeframe. Institutional leaders were becoming more aware and more sensitive to the issues of diversity and pay equity as a result of education, laws, legal battles, and societal pressures. An increasing number of leaders recognized that hiring practices and salary determinations, that consider qualifications, market demand, and experience, should be used.

Barriers to Career Advancement

Barriers and obstacles to career mobility can be either real or perceived. Some barriers are ones that involve choices in lifestyle or priorities. Research by Rouse (1999) examined career paths of female administrators in community colleges. Rouse identified the most significant barriers to advancement as being “the ‘old boys network,’ college politics, and family/spouse commitments.” Qualitative research by Gatteau (2000) of female presidents at selected higher education institutions found that these women followed a faculty/professor career path a minimum of 15 years, followed by administrative positions. The female presidents identified some of the challenges they faced as lack of female colleagues, sexist remarks, and community/faculty negativity and skepticism (§ 3). Women, in another study, cited imbalances with family and work, pay inequities, and the lack of support from supervisors for advancement opportunities as barriers to career mobility (Campbell, 1999).

Organization structure. Rouse’s (1999) study of Mississippi community colleges demonstrated that the organizational structure of the institution has a bearing on the numbers of females in administrative positions. Rouse’s report confirmed the findings of Touchton and Davis (1991) that most female administrators were clustered at the bottom of the career ladder, primarily in director positions. As Evans (2000) stated,

Large numbers of women dot the current workplace, but like trees on a mountain, you’ll see fewer and fewer of them as you climb higher in the executive landscape, until you reach a kind of timber line where you’ll find about as many women as you’ll find magnolias. (p. 10)

A study of women chief academic officers (CAO) in public community colleges discovered that their career paths began as faculty members (McKenney, 2000). They had held other administrative positions prior to serving as a CAO. The research revealed that the career paths of women CAOs in public community colleges was not influenced by gender, and women were moving faster in their career paths than their male counterparts.

Social consequences. Women who are promoted to senior administrative positions may experience some degree of social isolation from female peers. Matthews (1999), Vice-President for Academic Affairs at Marywood University, related the case of one woman whom she encouraged to apply for a deanship. Upon receiving the promotion, the woman appeared to be very successful in the position. Most of her colleagues were thus quite surprised when the new dean resigned at the end of the term. She was a single woman whose circle of close friends primarily included her previous female peers. Her promotion proved to be an irreconcilable interference to those relationships, prompting her to move on to a new institution.

Even starting fresh at a new institution may not eliminate all of the social hindrances for women administrators. Matthews (1999) and Becker (2002) asserted that part of the challenge women face is bridling their feminine socialization. From childhood, females are encouraged to cultivate such traits as benevolence, consideration, and understanding. Deciding on a course of action that may not yield a win-win situation for all involved is therefore quite uncomfortable for many women leaders. The command of social skills may also predispose women to service-oriented occupations (Matthews, 1999). The affirmation women in these roles receive may become almost a necessity to their self-esteem. Top administrators are often far removed from the one-to-one relationships that produce this affirmation, making the positions less attractive to some women.

Career versus family. A prerequisite for faculty members desiring most promotions to administrative positions is the achievement of the rank of full-professor (Wilson, 2001). This criterion is an impediment to many women. By the time a woman has earned tenure and been promoted to associate professor, she may be ready to have her first or an additional child. According to Joan Williams, director of the Program on Gender, Work, and Family at American University, herein is the source of potential conflicts for faculty members who are mothers: the concepts of tenure and promotion were developed at a time when virtually all faculty members

were men; if they had children, their wives bore the responsibilities of rearing the children as well as managing the household (Wilson, 2001). Thus, the duties of faculty evolved to the extent that Williams refers to their jobs as “oversized.” Women often plateau at the level of associate professor because the multitude of demands on their time and energy prohibits them from pursuing the volume or quality of research necessary to earn the next promotion. Iris Molotsky, spokeswoman for the AAUP, acknowledged that women are disproportionately affected by the need to sacrifice research and service opportunities to care for children and/or parents (Nann, 2000). This trade-off produces negative consequences for the career advancement of women.

Facilitators to Career Advancement

Research by Rouse (1999) examining the career paths of female administrators in community colleges cited “formal education, willingness to take risks, [and] prior administrative experience” (§ 5) as the most important contributors to career progress. These women also mention that increased job responsibilities, or new departments and assignments that require learning new skills, help to facilitate career mobility.

Leadership Characteristics

Uhlir (1989, p. 28) defined leadership as “the process of causing action through the orchestration of human talent” and as a method of inspiring people to contribute to the achievement of the organization’s goals through creative means. Uhlir suggested that it takes an “androgynous” person, one who uses behaviors considered both feminine and masculine, to be a good leader. Androgynous leaders choose from a spectrum of desirable behaviors—including “nurturance, assertiveness, courage, empathy, confidence, sensitivity, deference, [and] dominance”—depending on the circumstances to be addressed (p. 34). Female presidents, in a study by Gatteau (2000), reflected leadership qualities that included “developing a vision, serving as a symbol and role model, working collaboratively, fostering open communication, building community, delegating responsibility, taking risks, and maintaining perspective.” Gorenflo’s (1999) research on women deans found that these women practice a “supportive” leadership style.

Rosener (1990) grouped leadership styles into two categories: “command-and-control leadership or transactional” and “interactive or transformational leadership” (p. 120). Men tended to use the power and authority of their position to conduct transactions with their employees;

achievement is rewarded and incompetence is punished. The leadership behaviors of men can be described by terms such as competitive, strong, tough, and decisive. According to Carol Becker, Vice President for Academic Affairs at the School of the Art Institute of Chicago, one common leadership pitfall for women is becoming "more stereotypically male than men" (Becker, 2002). Becker asserted that this approach may do more harm than good to the cause of women administrators. Not only does a woman fail to employ her unique skills and abilities, but she also runs the risk of provoking increased opposition or resistance to female leaders in general.

In general, women lead employees by using interpersonal communication skills, sharing power, and encouraging the involvement and participation of their employees. Rosener (1990) explained that behaviors that are natural to women, such as cooperation, support, and understanding, are among the most successful approaches used in management. The results of a survey of the subordinates of male and female managers disclosed that female managers may be more capable than male managers in managing people and tasks, attaining high-quality results, communicating performance standards, promoting teamwork, seeing possibilities, respecting abilities of staff, and balancing work with needs of employees (Mize, 1992).

Tedrow and Rhoads' (1999) analysis of data collected from female community college administrators identified three categories of leaders: adapters, reconcilers and resisters. The adapters duplicated the men's behavior with a strong authority image and a depersonalized communication style. The reconcilers combined the typical leadership behaviors of women and men, depending on the situation. The reconcilers viewed themselves as goal-oriented and perfectionists, yet caring and inclusive. The resisters displayed behaviors that are relational, stressing teamwork and empowerment of employees. Tedrow and Rhoads inferred that these behaviors are women's reaction to a male-dominated organizational structure.

Ainsenberg and Harrington (1988) asserted that women work in a different system of social order. This order puts less emphasis on chain-of-command; is more inclusive, diverse, and collegial; prefers decentralized decision-making; and encourages individuality. Women's leadership strengths, according to Phifer (2000), included analyzing problems, communicating in writing, and fostering cultural values. In general, areas that might need improvement were the delegation to and development of staff, allocating resources, and collecting information. The findings of this

research are especially significant because Sanchez (1993) reported that institutions that embrace diversity in leadership also tend to be more flexible, innovative and responsive to student and community needs.

Career Development

Tedrow and Rhoads' (1999) findings indicated that changes in the college environment must occur to enable the increased advancement of women into higher education leadership positions. They recommended that professional development programs should be designed to identify policies that inhibit female leadership and determine ways to correct and improve the situation. Eaton (1984) suggested that administrators can facilitate the advancement of women by offering career development opportunities such as cross training, internal sabbaticals, and providing education/training support. Eaton also stated that, when empowering women as leaders, administrators as well as fellow employees need to become more familiar with women's operational styles. Tedrow and Rhoads (1999) agreed with Eaton (1984) and advocated educating all employees on the behavioral and communication differences between men and women to enhance the understanding of and respect for these differences.

Training. The number of women faculty and administrators is increasing; however, the proportion of women in these positions is not consistent with the number of graduates (Kaye & Scheele, 1975). Though women are being *educated*, they are not necessarily being *trained* to move into leadership positions. Chamberlain (1988) noted that while the business, government, and military sectors spend significant time and funds to educate their administrative staffs, higher education institutions do not. This deficiency is not because formal training venues are unavailable. A number of leadership training programs or academies have been developed in the United States. One of the most recognized higher education leadership training programs for women is the Summer Institute for Women in Higher Education Administration at Bryn Mawr University. The institute's curriculum includes traditional higher education administrative training in governance, finance, and management, as well as emphasis on career development and networking (Chamberlain, 1988; Secor, 1984). Women need not only education and training, but also opportunities to improve their skills to be prepared for upper-level administrative positions. A study of female presidents at four-year independent colleges reported that national professional development programs were extremely beneficial in fulfilling their career aspirations (Brown, 2000).

Women presidents of community colleges (Ballentine, 2001) viewed the doctorate as a necessary credential to progress to the senior administrative level. However, Ph.D. programs may not facilitate the development of leadership skills. Frye (1984) supported leadership development training as a component of graduate programs. He suggested ten areas of leadership study including organizational behavior, higher education law, effective human resource practices, financial management, and planning techniques. LeCroy (1984) added to Frye's (1984) suggestions by stating that postsecondary employers must provide in-house professional training, such as experiential leadership opportunities, in order to prepare potential leaders in higher education. Higher education administrators should identify potential women leaders and assist them in developing leadership skills. Kaye and Scheele (1975) suggested that leadership training for women should include management and organizational competencies, as well as training in negotiating and problem solving. A combination of mentoring, earning a doctorate, and gaining experience in administration assist in preparing women to be administrative leaders. Leadership is not a trait or characteristic, but a learned behavior developed over time involving education, training, experience, and opportunity.

Mentoring. For women to move into higher education leadership positions, mentors are invaluable. Lively (2000) reported that women provosts at prestigious research universities had mentors who provided advice and opportunities for experiences throughout their careers. In the study of women deans, Gorenflo (1999) reported that these women received professional support in their positions and had several informal mentors in their careers. Ballentine's (2001) research on women community college presidents found that they each had at least one mentor. The women explained that most mentors were male because few female administrative mentors were available, and that the mentoring relationships helped their professional development both directly and indirectly. Ragins and Scandura's (1994) study revealed that executive women are just as likely as men to serve as mentors, although women executives mentor women protégés more frequently than do men. Ragins and Scandura advised women who move into higher management positions to serve as mentors in order to facilitate women's career advancement opportunities. Although Cook's (1999) research indicated that men and women mentors offer similar mentoring functions, women mentors are able to offer gender-related career advice because they have frequently experienced similar barriers and struggles in their careers and lives (Saltzman, 1996).

According to the literature, some institutions and organizations have established formal mentoring programs (Rowe, 1993; Saltzman, 1996). Mentoring encourages the professional growth of both the mentor and protégé, and is therefore advantageous to the organization. The protégé receives encouragement, empowerment, and opportunities. The mentor renews and revives knowledge and remains current on new activities. Mentoring programs assist in relieving tensions between various levels of administrators and also provide opportunities for sharing. When institutions encourage mentoring, the number of mentoring relationships is likely to increase (LeCroy, 1984). A study of higher education administrators by Hytrek (2000) indicated that most of their mentoring relationships began in the first seven years of their administrative careers. This fact suggests that institutions should encourage mentoring relationships early in an administrator's career.

Networking. Women seeking career advancement opportunities may find support and encouragement through networking. Both formal and informal networks are helpful to career advancement. Organizations have been founded to assist in the development and employment of women in higher education. One of the earliest of these organizations is the Higher Education Research Services (HERS), which was founded in 1972. This organization was established by women administrators in order to offer services that included a talent bank, academic/career advising, and training (Chamberlain, 1988). The American Council on Education (ACE) established an Office of Women in Higher Education (OWHE); consequently, in 1977 the ACE/OWHE created the National Identification Program (NIP) for the Advancement of Women in Higher Education Administration (Shavlik & Touchton, 1984). ACE/NIP was designed to identify capable women, enhance their leadership skills and increase their opportunities for advancement.

Other associations that work to improve the equity of women in higher education include Women in Higher Education; American Association for Women in Community Colleges; American Association of University Women; and National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors (Kaplan, Secor & Tinsley, 1984). Informal networking occurs as well through state meetings, conferences, or on-campus groups, in which women work together to assist each other in moving up the career ladder.

Interview Study

In order to gain a better understanding of women in higher education administration, women administrators from eight states (Kansas, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Missouri, New Jersey, Ohio, Oklahoma, and Tennessee) were interviewed (see Appendix). These women had diverse undergraduate educational backgrounds (e.g., Biology, English, Health and Physical Education, Home Economics, Literature, and Music), with advanced degrees of MS, MBA, Ed.D., and Ph.D. They varied in age from 50-67 years. One administrator was at a community college; each of the others served at a four-year institution. These women served in the following capacities: president (1); vice president (4); associate provost (2); and director of an administrative department (1). Their experiences in higher education ranged from 22-26 years. They previously served as department chairs, directors, or deans. In their higher education careers, two had strictly served as administrators; the other women came up through the faculty ranks.

Participant Responses

The motivation to move into administrative positions was not originally a conscious one for the women interviewed. They described their moves into administration as being based on opportunity, timing, encouragement from others, salary, and availability. They all indicated that higher education courses and degrees, as well as in-service training courses aided their transitions into higher education administration. Also mentioned as assisting their career development were: belonging to professional organizations, counsel and support of colleagues, and experiential training. All participants indicated that they faced some type of barrier or obstacle to career advancement, but they were not unanimous in attributing the barriers to the fact that they were women. Respondents did note that there were still chauvinist males *and* females and that the "good old boy" method of advancement was still present in higher education. While noting that the administration of higher education in most institutions is still dominated by men, they felt that situations have improved and that women are moving into well-deserved positions of leadership.

Mentoring. Nearly all respondents indicated that they had been mentored (either formally or informally) as they advanced in their careers. All noted that they had been assisted, guided, or counseled by senior administrators, colleagues, and professional friends in their progress up the

career ladder. Most stated that they have mentored other women in higher education administration.

Facilitation. When asked what could have facilitated their progress in higher education administration, the women suggested that they should have set goals earlier or received training and preparation for administrative positions sooner. The women indicated that career advancement was not a priority early in their career.

Colleague interactions. The questions concerning daily interaction with male and female administrators elicited upbeat and interesting responses. All participants indicated that their interactions were positive with both men and women. Although all of the women seemed comfortable with the communications, they did express some reservations. One woman said she was usually accepted as “one of the boys” after a while, but worked hard to gain the men’s trust. Another woman indicated that her interactions with male colleagues were minimal because of differing job responsibilities, but that she was not a part of the male *clique* and had a significantly different management style from her male counterparts. Another woman expressed that some men still have a problem accepting her role and responsibilities at the university. Interactions with other women were expressed as more positive and accepting, although they noted that they had few female peers.

Comparisons. The women higher education administrators interviewed were candid and forthcoming with their responses. Although they shared some common experiences and opinions, alternate perspectives were also revealed. For instance, several women indicated that they thought the “glass ceiling” to higher education administration had been broken, but others disagreed. One woman stated that in her estimation, the proverbial barrier has barely been “cracked,” given the preponderance of men in the upper echelons of academe. Many women identified specific mentors who had assisted their trek along the career path. Conversely, one participant indicated that she had neither been mentored nor sought an opportunity to serve as a mentor herself.

Recent Accomplishments

Women now serve as presidents at several major universities. Included in this category are the Universities of Illinois, Michigan, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin (Kantrowitz, 2002). Additionally, women have been named to the CEO positions at Princeton, Duke, and Brown Universities. At Princeton, a woman is also the second in command at the

position of provost. Five of the nine vice presidents at Brown are women. Women executives are also gaining ground in the area of compensation. Three women were listed among the highest-paid presidents in U.S. academe in 2002.

These women have found a sense of humor an invaluable ally. For instance, one newly-promoted CAO (provost) was stopped by campus security because she had parked in the space reserved for the university's provost (Lively, 2000). Another woman noted that it took about two years for her male colleagues to stop introducing her as the "woman" provost."

Strategies and Recommendations

Based on the literature and the interviews, we offer the following advice to women considering the pursuit of a position in higher education leadership. Several interview participants advocated setting goals early in one's career. Another insight offered was the value of seeking leadership opportunities, such as chairing important committees or directing significant projects. Exploring the possibilities of leadership training, either internal or external to the institution, was also recommended.

Becker (2002) counseled women to find a balance—between their personal and private lives; between their female and male leadership traits; between the compassionate and assertive aspects of their personalities—with which they can be comfortable. She also advised developing a "public self" to handle criticism and make tough decisions, thus protecting the "private self" from becoming too vulnerable. Kathryn Mohrman (2001), as president of Colorado College, advocated women surrounding themselves with expert advisers who will serve dual functions: encourage them to succeed, while remaining objective in their advice.

Conclusion

The progress that women have made in higher education leadership has been slow, incremental, and arduous. Women have yet to be represented according to their availability at all levels of higher education, from faculty to CEO. Gains in equity may be attributed to affirmative action regulations and laws; career development and graduate programs; mentoring programs and networking; as well as increased gender awareness and acceptance of women in the academy and higher education administration.

Senior administrators must continue to encourage and expand the opportunities for women in higher education leadership. Career

development programs should be modified to be more accessible to women. These programs should include training in higher education policies and practices, leadership, diversity, and mentoring.

One means of achieving greater parity in the ranks of higher education leadership is for increased numbers of women to be placed in those positions in order to become role models and mentors to junior administrators and women faculty. A prerequisite is the acceptance and acknowledgment by both men *and* women of women's ability to succeed in leadership positions.

At the current rate of progress, it will take many years to reach the point where hiring and compensation decisions are made based solely on qualifications, ability, and experience, *and* where the higher education environment mirrors the students served. Organizations, government, institutions, and individuals must continue their efforts to encourage diversity at all levels of higher education. Although significant gains have been made in the advancement of women in higher education leadership, even greater progress is required.

References

- Aisenberg, N., & Harrington, M. (1988). *Women of academe: Outsiders in the sacred grove*. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press.
- Becker, C. (2002, January 25). Trial by fire: A tale of gender and leadership. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved July 8, 2002 from <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v48/i20/20b01501.htm>.
- Ballentine, A. (2001, May). In her own words: What led pioneers to seek a community college presidency. *Women in Higher Education*. Retrieved July 29, 2001, from <http://www.wihe.com/index>.
- Blum, D. E. (1991, October 9). Environment still hostile to women in academe, new evidence indicates. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved July 20, 2001, from <http://chronicle.com/search>.
- Brown, T. M. (2000). Female presidents of selected independent colleges: Career paths, profiles, and experiences. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61(2205), 06A. (UMI No. AAI0093565).
- Campbell, S. J. (1999). Women middle managers: Barriers and facilitators influencing career management. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60(4338), 12A. (UMI No. AAI9957903).
- Chamberlain, M. (Ed.). (1988). *Women in academe: Progress and prospects*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Cook, G. C. (1999). Mentoring relationships of women administrators in Mississippi's higher education system. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60(3209), 09A. (UMI No. AAI9946423).
- Daloz, L. A. (1999). *Mentor: Guiding the journey of adult learners* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Eaton, J. S. (1984). Tapping neglected leadership sources. In R. L. Alfred, P. A. Elsner, R. J. LeCroy, & N. Arnes (Eds.), *Emerging roles for community college leaders: New directions for community colleges* (no. 46) (pp. 93-99). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Evans, G. (2000). *Play like a man, win like a woman: What men know about success that women need to learn*. New York: Broadway Books.

- Frye, T. W., Jr. (1984). Developing leaders through graduate education. In R. L. Alfred, P. A. Elsner, R. J. LeCroy, & N. Arnes (Eds.), *Emerging roles for community college leaders: New directions for community colleges* (no. 46) (pp. 93-99). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gatteau, R. J. (2000). Breaking barriers in higher education: An exploration of female presidential leadership at six selective institutions. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61(2209), 06A. (UMI No. AA19974569).
- Gorenflo, B. A. (1999). An investigation of the career paths and leadership practices of women deans in schools/colleges of education. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60(1471), 05A. (UMI No. AAG9931861).
- Hanmer, T. J. (1996). *The gender gap in schools: Girls losing out*. Springfield: Enslow.
- Hensel, N. (1991). *Realizing gender equality in higher education: The need to integrate work/family issues*. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report 2. Washington, DC: The George Washington University, School of Education and Human Development.
- Hytrek, G. (2000). Institutional type and the mentoring of women in higher education administration. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, 2000). *Dissertation Abstract International*, 61(440), 02A. (UMI No. 9962059).
- Kantrowitz, B. (2002, June 10). A sorority of power. *Newsweek* 139(23), 8. Retrieved August 27, 2002 from Academic Search Elite.
- Kaplan, S., Secor, C., & Tinsley, A. (1984). Getting the best: Conclusions, recommendations, and selected resources. In M. Kramer (Ed.), *Women in higher education administration: New directions for higher education* (no. 45) 12(1), 85-91. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kaye, B. I., & Scheele, A. M. (1975). Leadership training. In J. B. L. Hefferlin (Series Ed.) & C. Rose (Vol. Ed.), *New directions for higher education* (Vol. 3) (3). Meeting women's new education needs (pp. 79-94). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- LeCroy, R. J. (1984). Building leadership expertise through on-the-job training. In R. L. Alfred, P. A. Elsner, R. J. LeCroy, & N. Arnes (Eds.), *Emerging roles for community college leaders: New directions for community colleges* (no. 46) (pp. 101-108). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lively, K. (2000, June 16). Women in charge. *The chronicle of higher education*. Retrieved July 20, 2001 <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v46/i41/41a03301.htm>.
- Matthews, P. (1999, July 9). Why some women shy away from college administration. *Chronicle of higher education (Career Network)*. Available: <http://chronicle.com>.
- McKenney, C. B. (2000). Women chief academic officers of public community colleges: Career paths and mobility factors. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61(445), 02A. (UMI No. AA19964337).
- Milem, J. F., & Astin, H. S. (1993). The changing composition of the faculty: What does it really mean for diversity? *Change*, 25(2), 21-27.
- Mize, S. (1992). Shattering the glass ceiling: Women in management. *Training and Development*, 46(1), 60-63.
- Mohrman, K. (2001, December 17). Making it less lonely at the top. *The chronicle of higher education*. Retrieved August 27, 2002 from <http://chronicle.com/jobs/2001/12/2001121701c.htm>.
- Moses, Y. (1997, December 12). Salaries in academe: The gender gap persists. *The chronicle of higher education*. Retrieved on July 20, 2001, <http://chronicle.com/search>.
- Nann, M. (2000, December 4). Women face many obstacles. *The GW Hatchet*. Retrieved August 27, 2002 from LexisNexis Academic, University Wire.
- National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (2001). Retrieved Dec. 30, 2002 from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/digest2001/ch3.asp>.
- Phifer, S. B. (2000). Perception and analysis of self-assessment leadership competencies of women administrators in higher education. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 61(48), 01A. (UMI No. AA19959281).
- Ragins, B. R., & Scandura, T. A. (1994). Gender differences in expected outcomes of mentoring relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(4), 957-972.
- Rosener, J. B. (1990). Ways women lead. *Harvard Business Review*, 68(6), 119-125.
- Rouse, S. E. (1999). Factors that influence the career development of Mississippi community college female administrators (women administrators). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60 (1858), 06A. (UMI No. AA19946355).

- Saltzman, A. (1996). Woman versus woman (lack of mentorship between older female executives and their younger female counterparts). *U.S. News & World Report*, 120(12), 50-54.
- Sanchez, A. A. (1993). Diversity in leadership, diversity in the classroom. *AACC Journal*, 63(3), 31-33.
- Secor, C. (1984). Preparing the individual for institutional leadership: The summer institute. In M. Kramer (Ed.), *Women in higher education administration, New directions for higher education* (no. 45) 12(1), 25-33. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Shavlik, D., & Touchton, J. (1984). Toward a new era of leadership: The national identification program. In M. Kramer (Ed.), *Women in higher education administration: New directions for higher education* (no. 45) 12(1), 47-57. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Smallwood, S. (2001, July 19). University of Maine citing inequities, gives raises to 199 female professors. *The chronicle of higher education*. Retrieved July 19, 2001 from <http://chronicle.com>.
- Tedrow, B., & Rhoads, R. (1999). A qualitative study of women's experiences in community college leadership positions. *Community College Review*, 27(3). Retrieved July 18, 2001 from [http://web4.infotrac.g.../purl=rcl_EAIM_0_A60498499\\$dyn=41!ar_fmt?sw_aep=lln_abpc](http://web4.infotrac.g.../purl=rcl_EAIM_0_A60498499$dyn=41!ar_fmt?sw_aep=lln_abpc)
- Touchton, J., & Davis, L. (Eds.). (1991). *Fact book on women in higher education*. American Council on Education. New York: Macmillan.
- Women in Higher Education*. (2001). *Gender differences in 1998-1999 administrative salaries*. College and University Personnel Association Annual Administrative Survey. Retrieved July 29, 2001 from <http://www.wihe.com/stats98.htm>.
- Uhlir, G. A. (1989). Leadership and gender. *Academe*, 75(1), 28-35.
- Wilson, R. (2001, November 9). For women with tenure and families, moving up the ranks is challenging. *The chronicle of higher education*. Retrieved August 27, 2002 from <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v48/i11/11a01101.htm>.

Appendix

Interview of Women in Higher Education Leadership

Demographic Information:

Name: _____	Number of years a faculty: _____
Title(s): _____	Number of years as admin in HE: _____
Institution Name: _____	Highest Earned Degree: _____
Level of Institution: _____	Highest Academic Rank: _____
Age: _____	Administrative Positions Held: _____
Major Academic Field: _____	_____

QUESTIONS:

1. What motivated you to move into administrative positions?
2. What experiences, education, or training assisted your move into administration?
3. Did anyone assist (mentor) you in your progress up the career ladder in higher education? How?
4. Did you experience any barriers, obstacles, or problems moving up the career ladder in higher education because you are a woman?
5. Did you experience any opportunities moving up the career ladder in higher education because you are a woman?
6. Do you feel women have broken the "glass ceiling" of administration in higher education or do you feel it is still dominated by men?
7. Have you mentored other women in higher education administration?
8. What could have facilitated your progress?
9. How would you describe your daily interaction with male administrators at your institution?
10. How would you describe your daily interaction with female administrators at your institution?