

## **INFORMATION TO USERS**

This reproduction was made from a copy of a manuscript sent to us for publication and microfilming. While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted. Pages in any manuscript may have indistinct print. In all cases the best available copy has been filmed.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help clarify notations which may appear on this reproduction.

1. Manuscripts may not always be complete. When it is not possible to obtain missing pages, a note appears to indicate this.
2. When copyrighted materials are removed from the manuscript, a note appears to indicate this.
3. Oversize materials (maps, drawings, and charts) are photographed by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each oversize page is also filmed as one exposure and is available, for an additional charge, as a standard 35mm slide or in black and white paper format.\*
4. Most photographs reproduce acceptably on positive microfilm or microfiche but lack clarity on xerographic copies made from the microfilm. For an additional charge, all photographs are available in black and white standard 35mm slide format.\*

**\*For more information about black and white slides or enlarged paper reproductions, please contact the Dissertations Customer Services Department.**

**U·M·I** Dissertation  
Information Service

University Microfilms International  
A Bell & Howell Information Company  
300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106



8625036

Kalenda, Lenore M.

PROFESSIONAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS AFFECTING THE  
ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN IN ADMINISTRATION IN LIBERAL ARTS  
COLLEGES IN MICHIGAN, INDIANA, OHIO, ILLINOIS, WISCONSIN,  
MINNESOTA, AND IOWA

*Michigan State University*

Ph.D. 1986

University

Microfilms

International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106





## PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark ✓.

1. Glossy photographs or pages \_\_\_\_\_
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print \_\_\_\_\_
3. Photographs with dark background ✓
4. Illustrations are poor copy \_\_\_\_\_
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy \_\_\_\_\_
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page \_\_\_\_\_
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages ✓
8. Print exceeds margin requirements \_\_\_\_\_
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine \_\_\_\_\_
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print \_\_\_\_\_
11. Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) \_\_\_\_\_ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered \_\_\_\_\_. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages \_\_\_\_\_
15. Dissertation contains pages with print at a slant, filmed as received ✓
16. Other \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

University  
Microfilms  
International



PROFESSIONAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS AFFECTING THE  
ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN IN ADMINISTRATION IN LIBERAL  
ARTS COLLEGES IN MICHIGAN, INDIANA, OHIO,  
ILLINOIS, WISCONSIN, MINNESOTA, AND IOWA

By

Lenore M. Kalenda

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Educational Administration

1986

## ABSTRACT

### PROFESSIONAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS AFFECTING THE ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN IN ADMINISTRATION IN LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGES IN MICHIGAN, INDIANA, OHIO, ILLINOIS, WISCONSIN, MINNESOTA, AND IOWA

By

Lenore M. Kalenda

Purpose. The purpose of this study was to identify the facilitators used (role models, sponsors, mentors), the positive factors perceived, and the barriers encountered by women administrators that may influence their career advancement. Additional investigation centered on their career aspirations and the support and opportunities for advancement they perceived to exist in the small liberal arts college.

Procedure. A survey instrument was used to collect the data. The subjects were 282 women employed in middle- and upper-level administrative positions in 112 undergraduate, independent liberal arts colleges in seven midwestern states. General descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviations, and rank order) were used. The chi-square test of association was used to determine relationships between two groups of administrators and their responses to items on the questionnaire. The response rate was 72%.

Findings. The majority of the women (77%) held appointments below that of dean. The careers of 63% of the respondents had been influenced by one or more role models, and 49% had a sponsor who aided their career development. The majority of women had the benefit of a male or female mentor.

Competence was ranked first as the most important positive influence on career advancement. Other key factors, ranked second, third, and fourth, were: drive/determination/persistence, appropriate academic credentials, and being in the right place at the right time/luck. Mentorship and sponsorship were ranked sixth and eighth, respectively. Affirmative action and female networking were not perceived as working effectively.

Women perceived as "important" barriers: responsibilities of career and family, pay inequity, having to be more experienced and highly qualified and having to work harder than their male counterpart to succeed, being excluded from the "old boy" network, and having less power and influence than their male counterpart. Few differences in perceptions were found between two groups of administrators.

Of those who had not yet achieved their highest career goal, 45% still aspired to a higher position. Fifty-eight percent of the respondents perceived the climate and selection process at their college to be supportive of women aspiring to advance in administration.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My respect and appreciation are extended to Dr. Richard Featherstone for his special guidance, help, and support while serving as my advisor and during his tenure as chairman of my doctoral committee.

I extend my heartfelt thanks to Dr. Eldon Nonnamaker and the other members of my doctoral committee, Dr. Mel Buschman and Dr. Robert Rentschler, for their professional direction and assistance, insight, and general support. A very special thank-you is given to Dr. Nonnamaker for his willingness to assume the chairmanship of my committee and to serve as my dissertation director.

On a professional and personal level, I would like to acknowledge the contribution made by Dr. Janet Wessel and William Parker, who gave me direction and support along the way.

On a personal level, I wish to thank Norman and Marian Kalenda, James and Sally Skidmore, Gertrude Wierenga, Elizabeth Flinchbaugh, and Joan Nelson, who believed in my abilities and offered continuous support and encouragement.

I am particularly grateful to my parents, Wayne and Marie Kalenda, for that deep kind of love, care, and support that only parents can give and that results in a belief in self. Thanks, Mom and Dad!

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	v
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Statement of the Problem . . . . .	8
Purposes of the Study . . . . .	9
Definition of Terms . . . . .	10
Design of the Study . . . . .	14
Limitations . . . . .	17
Delimitations . . . . .	17
Overview of the Study . . . . .	18
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	19
Introduction . . . . .	19
Literature Concerning Facilitators . . . . .	19
Literature Concerning Barriers . . . . .	45
Summary . . . . .	87
III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY . . . . .	90
Type of Study . . . . .	90
Population . . . . .	91
Development and Testing of the Survey Instrument . . . . .	93
Collection of Data . . . . .	97
Treatment and Analysis of the Data . . . . .	98
Summary . . . . .	99
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA . . . . .	100
Introduction . . . . .	100
Demographic Data . . . . .	101
Facilitators Used . . . . .	109
Positive Factors Perceived to Influence Career	
Advancement . . . . .	126
Barriers to Career Development . . . . .	131
Relationship Between Type of Position and Responses . . . . .	148

	Page
Career Aspirations . . . . .	156
Organizational Support . . . . .	163
Summary . . . . .	169
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	170
Summary . . . . .	170
Findings . . . . .	172
Conclusions . . . . .	181
Recommendations for Further Research . . . . .	193
APPENDICES . . . . .	195
A. COVER LETTER FOR PILOT TEST . . . . .	196
B. LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL AND FOLLOW-UP CARD AND LETTER FOR SURVEY . . . . .	198
C. SURVEY INSTRUMENT . . . . .	202
D. COMPLETE TITLES OF NINETEEN BARRIERS IN SECTION IIB OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .	209
E. WRITTEN COMMENTS BY WOMEN ADMINISTRATORS TO QUESTION 59 ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .	212
F. WRITTEN COMMENTS BY WOMEN ADMINISTRATORS TO QUESTION 60 ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .	224
G. WRITTEN COMMENTS BY WOMEN ADMINISTRATORS TO QUESTION 69 ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .	234
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	240



## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Age of Respondents . . . . .	101
2. Ethnic Background . . . . .	102
3. Highest Degree Held . . . . .	103
4. Field of Highest Degree . . . . .	104
5. Title of Present Position . . . . .	105
6. Number of Years in Present Position . . . . .	106
7. Number of Years in College Administration . . . . .	107
8. Present Salary Range . . . . .	107
9. Full-Time Student Enrollment . . . . .	108
10. Religious Affiliation of Institution . . . . .	109
11. Number of Respondents Influenced by a Role Model . . . . .	110
12. Number of Role Models . . . . .	110
13. Individuals Identified as Role Models . . . . .	111
14. Number of Respondents Whose Careers Were Aided by a Sponsor . . . . .	112
15. Number of Administrators Who Recognized a Male Sponsor and/or a Female Sponsor . . . . .	112
16. Most Important Influence Exerted by Male and Female Sponsors . . . . .	114
17. Number of Male Mentors . . . . .	116
18. Individuals Identified as Male Mentors . . . . .	117
19. Most Important Influence Exerted by My Male Mentor . . . . .	118

	Page
20. Number of Female Mentors . . . . .	120
21. Individuals Identified as Female Mentors . . . . .	121
22. Most Important Influence Exerted by My Female Mentor . . .	122
23. Number of Respondents Sponsoring a Protege . . . . .	124
24. Sex of Protege . . . . .	125
25. Number of Respondents Serving as Mentor . . . . .	125
26. Sex of Mentee . . . . .	126
27. Positive Factors Influencing Career Advancement . . . . .	127
28. Rank Order of Mean Scores of Positive Factors Influencing Career Advancement . . . . .	129
29. Barriers to Career Development as Perceived by Women Administrators . . . . .	132
30. Rank Order of Mean Scores of Barriers to Career Advancement as Perceived by Women Administrators . . . .	133
31. Barriers to Career Advancement as Experienced by Women Administrators . . . . .	135
32. Rank Order of Mean Scores of Barriers to Career Advancement as Experienced by Women Administrators . . .	138
33. Relationship Between Position Held and Responses to Items in Section IB . . . . .	149
34. Responses of Full-Time and Part-Time Administrators to Items 18, 19, 20, and 26 . . . . .	150
35. Relationship Between Position Held and Responses to Barriers in Section IIA . . . . .	152
36. Responses of Full-Time and Part-Time Administrators to Item 36 . . . . .	153
37. Relationship Between Position Held and Responses to Barriers in Section IIB . . . . .	153

	Page
38. Responses of Full-Time and Part-Time Administrators to Items 49 and 58 . . . . .	155
39. Number of Respondents Who Had Achieved Their Highest Career Goal . . . . .	157
40. Position of Highest Career Goal Achieved by Women Administrators . . . . .	157
41. Number of Respondents Wanting to Advance to a Higher Position . . . . .	158
42. Reasons Given by Respondents For Not Wanting to Advance to a Higher Position . . . . .	159
43. Highest Administrative Position to Which Respondents Aspire . . . . .	161
44. Preparation for Career Goals as Indicated by Respondents .	162
45. College Provision and Encouragement to Attend Adminis- trative Workshops as Perceived by Women Administrators .	164
46. Opportunities Made Available to Learn Administrative Techniques as Identified by Women Administrators . . . .	165
47. Perceptions of Respondents Concerning Whether Their College Climate and Selection Process Was Supportive . .	166

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

In 1964 Bernard indicated that some channels of ascent in academia were by way of rank, the administrative ladder, or positions of power and influence with co-workers through election to important policy-making bodies. She added that administration, however, had not been a common avenue to upward mobility for many academic women. Researchers have found that women still experience difficulty advancing by way of the administrative ladder.

Stevenson (1973) surveyed women in administrative positions in Big Ten universities. Among her findings, she found in an interview of 14 women that 10 perceived opportunity for advancement to be limited, and for some the only (unattractive) option appeared to be moving to another institution.

In 1977, Bauer studied women in administrative positions in continuing education units in Michigan colleges. She found that those currently employed were interested in, and probably qualified for, advancement to higher-level positions. However, she found that most considered the possibility of such an opportunity in their own institution to be nonexistent.

The federal government has issued a series of regulations requiring that equal employment opportunities be available regardless of sex or race. These regulations include the following statutes: the Equal Pay Act of 1968, as amended by the Education Amendments of 1972 (Higher Education Act); Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as amended by the Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972; Executive Order 11246 as amended by Executive Order 11375; and Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. However, according to Safilios-Rothschild (1978), these affirmative-action directives and policies appear to have very little effect on attitudes of employers and managers.

Addressing the issue of women in the labor force, Safilios-Rothschild indicated that employers' and managers' attitudes had not radically changed. Despite the gains made, there was still a tendency to hire a woman only when it was evident she was superior to all male candidates. She reported on a study that showed:

The present generation of graduate and undergraduate students in management hold traditional sex-role stereotypes that affect their evaluations of hypothetical job applicants. They tend to perceive women as applicants for clerical jobs and men as applicants for administrative management positions, even when both men and women indicate the same job aspirations. (p. 428)

Safilios-Rothschild added that individuals already working as employers and managers had more stereotyped views of women and their occupational roles than did students. They had been reported to feel that "women do not make good supervisors because they cannot appraise the seriousness of a performance problem and because both men and women feel uncomfortable with a woman supervisor" (p. 428).

Forisha (1981) noted that women are perceived differently from men and thus judged unequal in regard to professional potential. At the entry level, women are viewed as less qualified for higher-level positions.

A recent study by Astin and Snyder (1982) attempted to determine the results of efforts to improve the status of women in higher education institutions across the country. Their study was limited to women faculty and administrators and compared data collected in 1972 to those gathered in 1980. Their data showed that women's representation among all academic personnel and recent hires did increase over time. The same proportion (14%) of men and women in both years indicated their primary responsibility was that of administrator. However, female administrators reported lower-level administrative titles in 1980 than did male administrators. The investigators concluded that academic men and women are treated more equally today and that the survey data indicated changes in attitudes and beliefs are taking place. They claimed that men's views about women and affirmative action are less prejudiced today than a decade ago.

Preliminary findings of a current study prepared by the American Council on Education substantiated some of the findings of Astin and Snyder. According to this study, between 1975 and 1983, women made gains in nearly every administrative position. But, compared to the overall representation in higher education, they still lag behind men in their share of top leadership positions (Chronicle of Higher Education, 1985a).

With the advent of federal legislation mandating affirmative action, much overt discrimination has diminished. Women today, however, are victims of more covert, subtle kinds of discrimination that may affect their career aspirations and the organizational climate. Safilios-Rothschild (1978) indicated that it has been documented that the more women perform well and seek upper-level decision-making positions, the greater the sex discrimination; and the more rank and authority they achieve in the organization, "the more they tend to lose the friendship and respect of their colleagues, influence over peers, and access to information" (p. 429). She continued:

Women who want and manage to achieve a high status, experience a "cold war" and must have the psychology of long distance runners to endure the loneliness that comes from rejections by their colleagues. Many talented and hard-working women have found the psychological cost of high occupational aspirations and achievements unbearable, and this has dampened their ambitions. (p. 429)

Sandler (1984) reported that as a result of the anti-discrimination laws, major changes have occurred on almost every campus in the country, including the disappearance, to a large extent, of overt discrimination in official policies and practices. She emphasized, however, that despite the progress some things have not changed at all. For instance, regardless of the increase in the number of women in administrative roles, about 90% of students attend institutions where the three top administrative positions--president, chief academic officer, and dean--are held by men. And women attending the 1983 conference of the National Association for Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors in Houston, Texas, complained of isolation, stress, and lack of power. Participants at the conference pointed out

that old attitudes still exist, and she also indicated that women now face more subtle kinds of discrimination (Perry, 1983).

Higher education institutions have traditionally depended on those in the faculty ranks as potential policy-making administrators. It is now becoming more prevalent to recruit administrators who are trained in management skills, as well as drawing from the fields of law, business, and government. However, many administrators are still recruited from faculty, especially for positions of departmental chairperson and academic dean. But if women primarily are concentrated in the lower faculty ranks and must wait longer for promotion than their male colleagues, they do not rise to those ranks from which they can be promoted to administrative posts. Women have the right to equal access to administrative positions at all levels. Their chances for upward mobility may be impeded by constraints operating within the organization (National Project on Women in Education, 1977).

Investigators have identified many of these barriers. Men enjoy the benefits of an "old boy" network, an informal system providing information to other men as well as mentors to the younger, upward-aspiring male. Women are excluded from this system and thus are unable to receive job information available through the network (National Project on Women in Education, 1977).

In 1981, Stokes surveyed women administrators in the state colleges and universities in Florida. In her study she identified 23 organizational barriers encountered by women in administrative positions and also explored the effect of these constraints on their



positions and also explored the effect of these constraints on their careers. Some of the subtle barriers acknowledged by those surveyed: Women indicated they work twice as hard as their male counterparts; they believe they are less influential on decisions made by their superiors; and they feel that it is difficult to receive recognition for their accomplishments.

Karr (1983) studied men and women faculty from Big Ten Conference institutions to determine factors that influence career aspirations to administrative positions. She found that women's aspiration levels tended to be a little higher than men's, that male professors seemed to feel that women professors make less effective administrators, and that most women agreed that the "white-male club" promoted men over women for administrative posts.

There are insufficient numbers of successful women to serve as role models and mentors for other women. Women may turn to men as possible mentors if they can find one willing to do it (National Project on Women in Education, 1977).

Banfield (1976) investigated the personal characteristics, training, leadership style, rewards, and personal and organizational limitations and problems encountered by women in business, local government, and college and university administration in southern California. She found that several respondents indicated they had male mentors, eight women cited the lack of successful female role models as a problem for women, and the majority of respondents agreed that a protege system and informal structure did exist in their organization

from which women were excluded and which was detrimental to them. The subjects generally had aspirations below the top position in the organization.

The protege system (or sponsorship) is used as much in higher education as it is in other fields. Feldman (1974) pointed out, however, that a man may not be as willing to sponsor a woman. He may use her as an assistant but may not necessarily view her as a successor. Stevenson (1973) in a study of Big Ten universities reported that lack of sponsorship by men or women above them helped contribute to the difficulty women had in advancing in administration.

Forisha (1978) pointed out that a woman may not qualify for an upper-level position in more than one way. Potential chairpersons and leaders in other fields rarely suddenly appear:

They are subtly trained, encouraged, and then finally promoted through an official protege system in which those who "have made it" select out and groom specific proteges. As Epstein (1970) points out, such protege arrangements are difficult to establish between a man and a woman, particularly if the woman is either attractive or young. Thus, those groomed for and hence qualified for high positions are generally male. (p. )

It has been theorized that men are not as aware of sex bias as are women. Ferber and Loeb (1973) reported the existence of sex bias in the academic world. In addition, they reported that fewer men than women indicated an awareness of inequities in faculty pay and rank of equally qualified men and women.

Ralston (1974) investigated attitudes of those involved in the selection process that act as barriers to the selection of women for college presidencies in Florida. She found that female administrators

are aware of sex discrimination toward women. However, the members of the Board of Regents and the Chancellor, as well as members of the selection committees at the University of Florida and the University of West Florida, as a group, were unaware of sex discrimination or sex biases toward women aspiring to top decision-making posts in academia. She concluded that, since the Board of Regents made the final selection of a president, these attitudes can act as barriers to the selection of a woman. Ralston pointed out that, until the myths and barriers are removed, academic women must accept the fact that they must be more highly qualified than their male counterparts in order to hold decision-making posts in higher education.

#### Statement of the Problem

In the past decade many studies have dealt with women in administration at all educational levels, particularly elementary and secondary public school administration. Most of the research concerning women in higher education administration has focused on public state colleges and universities. There is a scarcity of research on women in academic administration in small liberal arts colleges.

The present study focused on the status of women in the small college organization. Are women substantially represented in academic management positions? Is the small college supportive, and does it provide opportunities for advancement of women in administration? Do the same or similar subtle barriers found in larger colleges and universities really exist in these smaller organizations? To what extent are facilitators (role models, protege systems, and mentoring

relationships) used? What factors influence career advancement? Answers to these questions can provide a basis for recommendations for change.

This study should provide a better understanding of the problems encountered by women in the small college organization so men and women can work together more effectively--as equals. The information will be helpful to academic women in better ascertaining the opportunities available in administration in the small college organization when making career choices. The obstacles women encounter and the awareness of these by both men and women should be the concern of the educational organizations and those employed by them. It is critical that these constraints be revealed, for

Today's universities should be the last place to tolerate discrimination of any sort, either overt or by the perpetuation of destructive social attitudes through sheer apathy. In fact, the university's educational responsibility requires it to be particularly sensitive to such attitudes. In its capacity as a test lab for ideas, the university must maintain a ceaseless program of self-evaluation, for, if it does not, it risks depriving its students of choice by passing on such attitudes unquestioned. (Scott, 1970, p. 4)

#### Purposes of the Study

The central purpose of this study was to determine if the same or similar facilitators and barriers that influence the career advancement of women in administration that have been identified by women administrators in some public colleges and universities would also be identified by women in administrative positions in the small, independent (private) undergraduate liberal arts colleges in seven "Big Ten" states: Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and

Iowa. Second, the study examined the career aspirations of women administrators and the climate, support, and opportunities they perceived as existing in their institution.

Specifically, this study attempted to answer the following research questions:

1. What percentage of women administrators in these independent four-year undergraduate coeducational liberal arts colleges have used facilitators (role models, protege systems, and mentoring relationships) during their careers?
2. What factors do these women administrators in liberal arts colleges identify as the most important positive influences on their careers?
3. What factors do women administrators in independent liberal arts colleges identify as barriers to their career advancement and/or career aspirations?
4. Is there a significant relationship between part-time administrators (division heads and departmental chairpersons) and full-time administrators with respect to their responses to each item in Section IB (Positive Factors Influencing Career Advancement) and Sections IIA and IIB (Barriers to Career Development) of the questionnaire?
5. What percentage of women administrators in liberal arts colleges aspire to higher-level administrative positions? If so, what steps are they taking to prepare for that career goal? If not, what reasons are given for not aspiring to a higher position?
6. What percentage of women administrators in liberal arts colleges perceive their institution as supportive and that opportunities exist in their institution for women to move into higher-level administrative positions?

#### Definition of Terms

Academic administrator. The individual who has direct responsibility for the management of instruction, curriculum, or any academic programs within the institution.

Academic dean. The individual in charge of faculties and schools and thus ultimately academic programs; popularly known as the "middle manager." The person directly underneath the central administrators and to whom departmental administrators are responsible. In some small institutions, the terms "academic dean" and "academic vice-president" are synonymous.

Academic department chairperson/departmental head. The person responsible for a particular instructional program. The chief administrator of the department and the channel of authority between the faculty and the central administration (Featherstone, 1972).

Affirmative action. A term that covers governmental agency "efforts to get universities to analyze their own employment situation, examine the available pool of qualified women and minority group members, broaden their personnel search procedures to encompass previously excluded groups, and set reasonable hiring goals" (Abramson, 1975, p. 96).

Affirmative action/equal opportunity mandates. Those federal regulations/statutes requiring that equal employment opportunities be made available regardless of sex and/or other reasons. These include the following: The 1963 Equal Pay Act; 1964 Title VII of the Civil Rights Act; 1965 Executive Order 11246; 1967 Executive Order 11246 as amended by Executive Order 11375; 1971 Revised Order number 4; 1972 Amended Equal Pay Act; Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972; Title VII of the Civil Rights Act as amended by the Equal Employment

Opportunity Act of 1972; and Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 as enforced under new regulations of 1975 (Bauer, 1978).

Barriers/constraints. Those factors operating within the individual and within the organization (including attitudes and stereotypes) that serve as obstacles to the advancement of women in an institution.

Facilitators. Factors that help advancement of an individual in the organization. For purposes of this study, these include:

a. Mentor. A support person. "A wise and trusted teacher." One who will teach a skill or provide the necessary knowledge to perform a particular task. A mentor has an apprentice, a learner. "A mentor may or may not be able to influence your career and need not have any particular clout in the organization" (Josefowitz, 1980, pp. 93-95).

b. Role model. The part played by an individual with a particular position or status and who serves as a standard for our own behavior (Ralston, 1974).

c. Sponsor/protege system. "One who vouches for the suitability of a candidate for admission." A sponsor has a protege, "one whose welfare, training or career is promoted by an influential person." He/she may have little to teach you about your job, "but can help your career by recommending you for special projects, by speaking for you, by taking you along on assignments. A sponsor focuses on your future and must have influence in the organization" (Josefowitz, 1980, pp. 93-94).

Liberal arts colleges and universities. Independent (private) four-year undergraduate institutions having a liberal arts commitment in addition to providing career-preparation programs. These include both Liberal Arts I and II institutions, as classified by the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education (1976).

"Old boy" network. Originating in Britain, the term "old boy" referred to an alumnus of a preparatory school or public school. The "old boy network" refers to the bonds, the upper-class kinship, established among British public school boys. These bonds were "supposed to operate throughout life in social and, particularly, in business and professional life" (Shur, 1980, p. 173). As used today, the term refers to the male network of support and information sharing.

Public state colleges and universities/public four-year institutions of higher education. "An institution offering four years or more of higher education study and whose principal governance and financial support are responsibilities of publicly elected or appointed legislative bodies at institutional and state levels" (Bauer, 1978, pp. 8-9).

Sex discrimination. "Sex discrimination simply means that qualified women are being bypassed for jobs while men with lesser qualifications gain employment" (Abramson, 1975, p. 223).

Sex-role stereotype. "Displaying or adopting all or most of the behaviors traditionally associated with one's sex role, as delineated by one's culture" (Unger & Denmark, 1975, p. 819).



Sexual harassment. Sexual harassment takes the form of innuendos, of sexual remarks, of touching in possessive or sexual ways, and/or of expectations of sexual favors (Josefowitz, 1980).

Socialization. "The processes through which a person acquires the thought and behavior patterns of his culture" (Unger & Denmark, 1975, p. 819).

Stereotype. "A belief or attitude that is widespread in society and oversimplified in content. Generally resistant to change" (Unger & Denmark, 1975, p. 820).

Women administrators--full time. Women employed full time in one of the positions identified in the HEP 1985 Higher Education Directory and/or the 1985 Yearbook of Higher Education and who function in an administrative capacity more than 50% of the time.

Women administrators--part time. Women employed full time in a higher education institution and who function in the capacity of departmental chairperson or division head as well as faculty member. These positions are identified in the HEP 1985 Higher Education Directory and/or the 1985 Yearbook of Higher Education.

### Design of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine the facilitators used and barriers perceived by women administrators in the small higher educational organization that may influence their upward mobility and/or career aspirations. Further investigation centered on their career aspirations and the support and opportunities that exist in the small college.

### Population

The population used in this study comprised women holding administrative positions in four-year coeducational private liberal arts colleges in the "Big Ten" states, that is, Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Iowa. The list of personnel was limited to those women identified in the HEP 1985 Higher Education Directory, the 1984-85 Yearbook of Higher Education, and catalogues from selected institutions. All women in middle- and upper-level administrative positions were contacted and asked to participate in this investigation. No women administrators who were members of a religious order were included.

### Procedure

The descriptive method of research, using the survey technique, was employed in this study. "Descriptive studies are primarily concerned with finding out 'what is'" (Borg & Gall, 1983, p. 354). "Survey research utilizes a variety of instruments and methods to study relationships, effects of treatments, longitudinal changes, and comparisons between groups" (Borg & Gall, 1983, p. 354). It appears that descriptive research is an appropriate technique to examine those factors that may affect upward mobility of women in liberal arts colleges as perceived by women administrators.

A structured questionnaire was designed by this investigator based on a review of the literature and conversations with some women

administrators in higher education. One of the sections addressing the problem of career barriers especially used the work of Stokes (1981).

A pretest of the initial instrument was made, involving seven women experienced in administration in higher education. A revised instrument was tested in a pilot study involving women administrators employed in private, four-year liberal arts colleges in Pennsylvania. They were asked to complete the questionnaire as well as a reaction/comment/suggestion sheet. A cover letter explained the purpose of the study and assured the respondents of confidentiality. Comments solicited from the participants, as well as a brief analysis of the data, were used to determine the necessary revisions in order to improve the effectiveness of the instrument.

The final questionnaire comprised questions designed to identify facilitators (role models, protege systems, and mentors) used by women administrators, factors they perceived as having a positive influence on their careers, and career barriers experienced/encountered. In addition, questions addressed their career aspirations and the support, climate, and opportunities existing in their institution.

#### Treatment of Data

The information collected was recorded and processed at the Computer Center, Michigan State University. Descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviations, and rank order) were used. The chi-square test of association was used to determine relationships between two groups of administrators--full-time administrators and part-time administrators (division heads and departmental

chairpersons)--and their responses to certain items on the questionnaire.

### Limitations

1. The representative population was limited to those women administrators willing to participate in the study.

2. The instrument, a questionnaire, was used to collect the data. However, the results are subject to the limitations associated with the use of such data-gathering methods and techniques. That is, sometimes data are overlooked and are needed for clarification; however, that information cannot be obtained later. The questionnaire provides no immediate feedback for clarification purposes or in-depth probing (Borg & Gall, 1983).

### Delimitations

1. The study was restricted to all middle- and upper-level women administrators in independent four-year coeducational liberal arts colleges in Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Iowa. The population did not include women administrators employed in public higher education institutions or those in all-male or all-female institutions.

2. The population was delimited to those women identified in the HEP 1985 Higher Education Directory, the 1984-85 Yearbook of Higher Education, and catalogues from selected colleges. The population did not include administrators who were members of a religious order.

3. Library research included ERIC and Dissertation Abstracts information searches and books and periodicals on file at Michigan State University Library; the Teaching Resources Library, Erickson Hall, Michigan State University; Grand Valley State College Library; Calvin College Library; and Aquinas College Library, as well as published and unpublished material obtained through inter-library loan with Aquinas College Library and books and materials owned or borrowed by this investigator.

### Overview of the Study

Chapter I introduced the nature of the problem that was investigated. The statement of the problem was given. The purpose and research questions were stated, followed by a definition of terms. The design of the study and limitations and delimitations were outlined.

Chapter II contains a review of the related literature, with emphasis on factors facilitating women's career advancement (role models, protege systems, and mentoring relationships) and barriers perceived to impede their advancement (particularly attitudes and stereotypes).

The design of the study is discussed in Chapter III. The population is defined. The instrument, a questionnaire, is described, as are the data-collection methods employed. Procedures for analyzing the data are explained.

Chapter IV contains the findings of the study and an analysis of data. A summary of the findings and conclusions is presented in Chapter V. The chapter concludes with suggestions for future research.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

#### Introduction

A survey of the literature indicated that research pertaining to the status, career aspirations, socialization, strategies, and problems of women employed in administrative positions is substantial. The related literature examined for this study is divided into two main areas: (1) literature concerning facilitators to women's careers in administration--role models, mentorship, and sponsorship; and (2) constraints influencing women's career advancement in administration--internal barriers and external barriers. This review will serve as a background for the research undertaken, as well as for a comparison to the findings regarding facilitators and barriers affecting the careers of women administrators in small, independent higher education institutions.

#### Literature Concerning Facilitators

##### Role Models

Shapiro, Haseltine, and Rowe (1978) described role models as "individuals whose behaviors, personal styles and specific attributes are emulated by others" (p. 52). There is considerable documentation in the literature concerning the importance of role models in career

development and success. Fisher (1978) explored the possible factors influencing Michigan female teachers' aspirations for an educational administration position. The participants in her study agreed that without examples of successful women administrators (role models) women students are unlikely to aspire to administrative positions.

Gasser (1975) investigated the personal and professional characteristics of 434 upper- and lower-level women administrators in higher education and their career attitudes. Her study also identified the positive and negative cultural, personal, professional, and institutional factors that women perceive as influencing their advancement to top-level administrative positions. Contact with a role model was cited as a primary positive influence by about 44% of lower-level and almost 36% of upper-level administrators.

Data from Bickel's (1980) study led her to conclude that female role models are important for women. McNutt's (1979) research focused on the existence and influence of role models in the professional lives of top-level women administrators in higher education in southern states. The four most influential models were found to be both male and female college teachers, mother, and father. A large percentage reported their most influential model to be their teacher or college professor. More respondents identified a female than a male as the most influential role model but named more males than females as role models. It was logical, according to McNutt, that respondents in the study identified more males: "Because there are more males than

females who are college professors, there are more male than female models available at this level" (p. 105).

The role models influenced the administrators in a number of ways. Respondents indicated that their role models "encouraged them to realize their capabilities, to have a career and to become an educator" (pp. 101-102). A large percentage indicated that "the model had displayed specific characteristics or patterns of action which they wished to imitate" (p. 101). Although the study "showed the importance of significant others" (relatives, teachers, friends) "serving as role models, . . . it revealed little significant relationship between the sex of the model and the model's influence" (p. 104).

Based on her findings, McNutt recommended that professional women be available to serve as role models for young girls. Her data revealed that

Administrators who recognized a female as the most influential role model decided at an earlier age to have a career. By observing these models, girls, as well as boys, may be encouraged to make career decisions early in life. (p. 106)

Family support has been cited as an important factor in career development. Parents can strongly influence their daughters' occupational aspirations and decisions. Dressler (1981) found that a majority of the 55 women administrators in her study had been encouraged by their parents to pursue their academic goals. "Parental role models and family training had been sources of motivation to achieve" (p. 115). Dressler concluded: "An encouraging, supportive family is



definitely an asset to any woman in administration. Early parental role models continue to be powerful motivators throughout life" (p. 121). When asked if they themselves served as role models to others, 49 of the 55 women (89%) in Dressler's study said "Yes." Many of the women indicated it was a very rewarding experience.

The data in McNutt's (1979) study indicated that mothers who work are more likely to be named as role models influencing career choice than mothers who do not work. Douvan (1976) cited studies that suggested that daughters of working mothers had higher career aspirations than those whose mothers did not work outside the home.

Investigators have pointed out that because of the limited number of women faculty and administrators, especially those in top-level positions, women students do not come into contact with potential role models (Astin, 1977; Unger & Denmark, 1975). Astin (1977) stated that the "absence of women in top administration can create an environment that lacks not only role models for women who might ultimately become administrators, but also the unique perspective that women might bring to the varied tasks of administering a college" (p. 63). He added that 19 out of every 20 freshmen attend a college "in which all three key administrative posts" (presidents, chief academic officers, and deans of arts and sciences) "are held by men" (p. 63).

Women in Gasser's (1975) study indicated that a limited number of women faculty members were available to serve as role models or mentors during graduate study and early employment. Middle managers in Banfield's (1976) study reported that the lack of successful female

role models is a problem for women. "There are so few women models, so each woman has to learn by experience, making mistakes. . . . Early in my career, I almost left business because I saw no model I wanted to follow" (p. 95).

Follett et al. (1980) commented:

It is conceivable that the woman student, observing the underrepresentation of women in certain careers, including those of higher academic status, decides that certain life choices--for instance, for the higher intellectual life--are "for men only." (p. 39)

There was agreement among the women in Karr's (1983) study that "female students who never experience women in leadership roles are not likely to develop aspirations for administrative roles" (p. 182).

Karr suggested:

Since academic administration is a non-traditional field for women and a field in which women lack role models, faculty should provide talented women with as much encouragement as possible. Women, in comparison to men, have fewer role models and mentors and might be less inclined to pursue an administrative position without this type of encouragement. (pp. 186-87)

Gappa and Uehling (1979) commented:

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

Three investigators alerted readers to possible limitations of the concept of role models in relation to career progress. Shapiro, Haseltine, and Rowe (1978) focused on women who had decided to enter a profession and the issue of "moving up" in a particular profession. After examining the concept of role models, they came to the conclusion

that role models "are, at best, of limited effectiveness in assisting women to actually gain positions of leadership, authority, or power" (p. 51).

Shapiro et al. claimed that female role models may be more inhibiting than helpful in women's career advancement. Haseltine cautioned against searching for a role model who "exemplifies totally the kind of life one wants to lead"--it is impossible to find that perfect "combination that constitutes a desired role model for a specific individual" (p. 53). In addition, she contended that professional women who have been successful and thereby qualify as role models became so under entirely different circumstances than those facing succeeding generations. She suggested that the use of partial or multiple role models--both male and female--may be more appropriate and useful. She concluded that

Role models, both as general examples of what is possible and as models for particular traits, are important ingredients in the development of professional identity and commitment. As a prescription for "making it"--for attaining leadership, authority, or power--role models are not sufficient and in some cases may be counter-productive. (p. 54)

Follett et al. (1980) suggested:

Women students often show a lack of definiteness and realism about expectations for adult roles. Through occupational role models, women can gain a broader exposure to the nature of work roles and can begin to see themselves as capable of performing well in jobs often thought unsuitable for women. (p. 30)

Follett et al. cited a 1974 investigation by Almquist in which two-thirds of the undergraduate women who had chosen a masculine occupation knew beforehand a woman in the chosen occupation. "Almquist found that

role models, whether male or female, served to stimulate students' interests in particular occupational fields" (pp. 30-31). The authors concluded that the "myth that certain roles are meant for men and others for women can be dispelled through acquaintance with role models" (p. 31).

The National Science Foundation began a grants program in 1982 to increase the visibility of women in science and engineering and to encourage them to choose careers in those fields. One physicist pointed out that participants in the program act as role models. She added that because there were so few women in physics, it was important to motivate women to enter that field. Another commented, however, that there is an increasing number of role models to show young women they can succeed in science and engineering. Margrete S. Klein, director of the National Science Foundation women's program, said that even though

both overt and covert discrimination has lessened throughout society, women and minority-group members still face assumptions by some white male scientists about who is competent in science or math. . . . By putting women scientists into academic departments you're at least sending the message to girls in undergraduate programs that women can be physicists. (Engelgau, 1984, p. 6)

### Mentorship and Sponsorship

Two strategies that have been used to gain access to and thus increase the representation of women in higher education are mentoring and sponsoring relationships. Much has been written about mentorship and sponsorship; however, a review of the literature also disclosed some inconsistency in the use of the terms. Although there is some

agreement, the term "mentor" does not mean the same thing to everyone. The related term "sponsor" is sometimes used interchangeably with "mentor." Moore and Salimbene (1981) claimed that the term "mentor" has supplanted the terms "sponsor" and "role model" in the literature since the 1970s.

These support persons have been called benefactors, patrons, rabbis, godfathers, counselors, and gurus (Hennig & Jardim, 1981; Josefowitz, 1980; Kanter, 1977; Levinson, 1978). Furry (1980) defined a mentor as a close, trusted, and experienced counselor or guide. A mentor, as defined by Josefowitz, is a "wise and trusted teacher" (p. 93), a counselor. A mentor has an apprentice--a beginner, a learner. A sponsor, on the other hand, is "one who vouches for the suitability of a candidate for admission" (p. 93). A sponsor has a protege, "one whose welfare, training or career is promoted by an influential person" (p. 93).

Yale psychologist Daniel J. Levinson studied the life cycles of men in The Seasons of a Man's Life (1978). He explained that the mentor is not only a teacher, advisor, or sponsor, but much more than these. He believed that the mentor relationship is similar to the intense relationship between two people--parents and offspring, spouses, and so on. The mentoring relationship lasts about two to three years. The mentor is usually older and has more experience and seniority.

Moore and Salimbene's (1981) thinking followed similar lines. They referred to mentoring as the "process by which older, more

experienced administrators pass on their accumulated wisdom to younger men who are identified as possessing qualities valued by the organization" (p. 51). The "old boy network" grew out of this process. In their examination of the mentoring process through intensive interviews of 35 male and female administrators in higher education in Pennsylvania, the authors chose to define the term "mentor" as:

an intense, lasting, and professionally-centered relationship between two individuals in which the more experienced and powerful individual, the mentor, guides, advises, and assists in any number of ways the career of the less experienced, often younger, upwardly mobile protege. (p. 53)

Josefowitz (1980) believed function differentiates "mentor" from "sponsor":

A mentor will teach you a skill or provide you with the knowledge necessary to perform an identifiable task. Mentoring is focused in the present. A mentor teaches what you need to know now. A mentor may or may not be able to influence your career and need not have any particular clout in the organization. A sponsor may have very little to teach you about your job, but can help your career by recommending you for special projects, by speaking for you, by taking you along on assignments. A sponsor focuses on your future and must have influence in the organization. (p. 93)

Josefowitz added that a mentor can help a person get started and learn the job and the organization's rules. The sponsor has influence in the organization and will help his protege get promoted. She explained that mentors and sponsors operate at all levels of the organizational hierarchy. But more mentoring is needed at the lower levels, while more sponsoring occurs higher up. The protege has already arrived, has proven herself, and needs help to the next level. "Each time you reach a new level, you need a mentor to teach you the ropes, but as soon as you know them, you need a sponsor to help you reach the next level"

(p. 94). A collegial relationship exists between sponsor and protege. Josefowitz pointed out that the same person could serve as both mentor and sponsor.

Kanter (1977) found that the informal social network in organizations is very important and that power comes from these social connections. Sponsors ("mentors and advocates upward in the organization") are part of such connections.

Sponsors are often thought of as teachers or coaches whose functions are primarily to make introductions or to train a young person to move effectively through the system. However, there are three other important functions besides advice that generate power for the people sponsored. First, sponsors are often in a position to fight for the person in question, to stand up for him or her in meetings if controversy is raised, to promote that person for promising opportunities. . . . Second, sponsors often provide the occasion for lower-level organization members to bypass the hierarchy: to get inside information, to short-circuit cumbersome procedures, or to cut red tape. People develop a social relationship with a powerful person which allows them to go directly to that person, even though there is no formal interface, and once there, a social interchange can often produce formal results. . . . Third, sponsors also provide an important signal to other people, a form of "reflected power." Sponsorship indicates to others that the person in question has the backing of an influential person, that the sponsor's resources are somewhere behind the individual. (pp. 181-82)

Although Kanter said at a later date that sponsors are "also known inappropriately as 'mentors'" (Kanter, 1979, p. 67), she referred to sponsors as mentors, teachers, or coaches. The functions she discussed appear to be more a description, not of mentors but of sponsors as outlined by Josefowitz. This observation was also noted by Villani (1983).

According to Levinson (1978), the mentor may act as a teacher or he may serve as a sponsor using his influence to help the man enter

and advance in the organization. Or he may act as a guide, acquainting his protege with the customs, values, and "others" of the organization. Further, he may act as a model whom the protege can emulate. He can also be a counselor and lend his support in times of need or stress. The true mentor's most important function, however, is to aid or help the young person's development by believing in him, sharing and supporting his dream, and "creating a space in which the young man can work on a reasonable, satisfactory life structure that contains the dream" (pp. 98-99).

At a recent conference, Bea Orr (1984), then president of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, shared her thoughts and experiences on mentoring. She stated, "Mentors teach, advise, open doors, encourage, promote, cut red tape, show the politics and subtleties of the job, and believe in proteges, thus helping them succeed." Orr pointed out that mentors have knowledge, skills, and power that proteges lack and need. They show them the ropes through the organization. They help unlock leadership potential. They are the steady hand on the shoulder when things get tough. She stated further:

Mentors can be door-openers, string pullers, wheel greasers. Because they often have the benefit of an outsider's vantage point, mentors can provide their proteges with hefty doses of insight and objectivity. Mentors can help others conquer the inner fears, doubts, and second guessing that invariably are part of personal and professional decision making.

She referred to mentors as "career cheerleaders (or critics)." A mentor is someone who spots potential individuals within the



the right advice at the right time, as well as one who, in times of challenge or crisis, offers something more than words of encouragement. "Mentors often are able to offer the most help to their proteges in times of challenge or crisis--they, after all, are likely to have faced many of the same problems." As women gain competencies and skill and grow professionally and begin to assume their own responsibilities, "the mentoring relationships realign themselves as peer relationships."

Missirian's (1980) findings supported Orr's observation:

Each of the women who acknowledged their mentor still enjoys a viable relationship with that person. While the "teacher/pupil" aspect of the relationship no longer exists, the mentors and proteges in this study were able to finesse a transition to a compeer relationship. They were able to acknowledge their love for one another, and the richness of their relationship continues as a deep friendship. (p. 139)

Shapiro et al. (1978) proposed a "patron system," which includes a range of advisors/guides with mentors at one end of this continuum and "peer pals" at the other end. Sponsors and "guides" then serve as middle points along the continuum. They defined mentors as

the most intense and paternalistic of the types of patrons described by this continuum. . . . Sponsors serve as the two-thirds point. . . . They are strong patrons but less powerful than mentors in promoting and shaping the careers of their proteges. (p. 55)

Guides, at the one-third point, "are less able than mentors and sponsors to fulfill the roles of benefactor, protector, or champion of their proteges" (p. 55). They can, however, explain the system and, as their primary function, point out pitfalls and shortcuts. The term "peer pals" describes "the relationship between peers helping each

other succeed and progress" (p. 56) by acting as sounding boards and sharing information and strategies.

How does one establish a mentor relationship? Orr (1984) believed that it just happens. She felt you may be watching someone and find that she is the kind of person you want on your own staff. Who takes the first step? She felt that it has to be the mentor because the potential protege does not feel comfortable making that initial step. Other investigators have advised women not to sit back and wait, but aggressively to seek out male mentors (Halcomb, 1980; Moore & Salimbene, 1981). Men have found mentors through their "old boy" network. They can be friends with or without influence, inside or outside the organization, someone along the organizational hierarchy (Josefowitz, 1980). Josefowitz pointed out that even if the boss is the mentor, he still may not be sufficiently influential to act as a sponsor. Thus, women may have to look elsewhere. She advised women to make their goals known and to seek visibility by taking on projects. Finding a mentor is easier, according to Josefowitz, because "it is easier to ask for specific help than to ask someone to be your advocate . . . to speak on your behalf or to ask advice with your career plans" (pp. 95-96). With a mentor, then, one can take the initiative; with a sponsor, one must pave the way so a sponsor can take the initiative on one's behalf.

Does gender make any difference? According to Fury (1980), women at the executive level know "they'll need all the help they can get" (p. 44). If these women firmly believe that they need to develop

strong relationships with a person who has power and influence in order to succeed, it is quite probable that that teacher/sponsor/guide and friend will be a man because of the distribution of power and influence in the business world.

The women in Bickel's (1980) study concurred. Bickel surveyed women doctoral candidates in higher education and student personnel administration. When asked to identify strategies participants most often used or anticipated using to help their career advancement, 71% said "develop a sponsorship relationship with a professional male" and 69% indicated they would "find a successful woman to serve as a mentor or sponsor" (pp. 41, 46). Bickel concluded that mentors are valuable in gaining entrance to and promotion within higher education administration.

Women interviewed expressed the opinion that the primary purpose for having a mentor was to be associated with a person powerful enough to aid their career. Interviewees further contended that since so few women hold positions of power in higher education administration, men are often better suited to serve as mentors. (p. 77)

These findings supported the work of Josefowitz (1980). She added, however, that a woman sponsor has some qualities not found in a male sponsor. She can serve as a role model. She also

understands what it is like to be a woman in your position, for she has most certainly been there herself. A woman sponsor can relate to the particular problems of women in organizations and can sympathize with the multitude of roles women must prioritize and play. (Josefowitz, 1980, pp. 96-97)

Women holding executive positions of vice-president and higher in a recent Wall-Street Journal and Gallup organization survey

acknowledged that men had made an important contribution to their careers. Of 722 female executives surveyed, 82% admitted that the individual most helpful in their career advancement had been a man. Almost four out of five younger women claimed that they had had a male mentor (Rogan, 1984).

The men in Levinson's (1978) study were almost all male mentors. However, Levinson felt that a "relationship with a female mentor can be an enormously valuable experience for a young man" (p. 98). He added that a woman can also benefit by having a male mentor. He believed that women experience less mentoring than men. One of the major problems confronting women, he felt, is the scarcity of female mentors, especially in the workplace. Those few who may be available are too busy trying to survive in a male-dominated work world.

Orr (1984) has mentored both men and women. She said that mentoring has traditionally been a man's activity. However, women can be mentors to the male as well as to the female. The key to it is that care and respect that they have for each other. What is needed is that special relationship between two people for the mentoring relationship to work. One strategy recommended by several people is to develop important relationships with several mentors, both male and female. If one of the mentors becomes less influential or powerful, then one can continue with the others (Fury, 1980; Halcomb, 1980).

It's not at all unusual for someone to have more than one mentor. Each may play a distinct and significant role. One, for example, might impart practical, day-to-day training and advice; the other might scout for new job opportunities and provide contacts and recommendations. (Orr, 1984)

Fury (1980) advised that women who wish to succeed

draw on a number of available resources--talented peers, knowledgeable friends higher in the organization, the women in professional networks, mentors or sponsors or good bosses if they're lucky--to insure that they, their work and their goals become known to those who can help. (p. 47)

Hennig and Jardim (1981) recommended to those wishing and planning for a career and who are at the point of "filling in the space between where you are and where you want to go" to begin to look for a coach, a mentor, an advocate, "someone in a more senior management position who can teach her, support her, advise her, critique her. To succeed in this she must present herself as someone worth investing in, as someone who can make a return on the help she receives" (p. 162).

Alvarez (1979) stated that sponsorship is viewed as the willingness to exercise power on behalf of an individual or individuals. The "sponsor's power is in part independent and in part dependent upon the sponsor's social system location inside or outside the organization and above, at the same level, or below that of the person being sponsored" (p. 38). It is now a "standard observation that the eminence of the sponsor directly affects the career of the former student" (p. 390), and there is evidence that it affects women more than men.

These persons are in a position to give advice in career management, to look out for and forewarn about potential difficulties, to recommend experiences that may later be deemed desirable for promotion, and so forth. In short, the sponsor may act as a guardian angel. (p. 48)

Alvarez suggested that

among those qualified for a position based on meritorious prior performance, the person selected for appointment is most likely to be the one who has the most extensive degree of sponsorship by those able to influence (whether appropriately or not) the

selection process. Strong sponsorship may further a career that lacks some merit as much as high merit (based on either achieved or ascribed factors) may further a career that lacks some sponsorship. However, it is very unlikely that much career advancement is possible without a fairly good balance between merit and sponsorship. (p. 47)

In outlining some strategies for moving up the organizational hierarchy, Scott (1979) cautioned:

Don't be duped by the argument that professional advancement is assured by hard work or more education. This is not to say that hard work and educational credentials are unimportant; they are important. However, many minorities and women waste invaluable time and money in search of the right degree or working themselves "to the bone" with the hope that some superior will notice and justly reward them. Unfortunately, much of the key to professional ability is related to timing and how successfully one presents and handles oneself in strategic situations; e.g., committee assignments related to tasks viewed as crucial to the future of the institution. (p. 37)

Among the strategies Scott recommended, and the one she indicated as the first and most important, was finding a mentor

or someone who takes a professional interest in your professional goals. A mentor must be able to both praise and criticize your work, and should be an individual who is relatively secure in his/her self-concept. Because a mentor can be such an important person in your life, you must choose such an individual carefully. (p. 37) . . . You should also be aware of the fact that you cannot have a mentor forever. You must eventually overcome or outgrow your dependence on your mentor and start relating to him/her as a peer. (p. 38)

Scott pointed out that your growing independence is an indication of the success of the mentoring relationship. Sheehy (1976) also argued, "Sooner or later every apprentice must refute the absolute power of the mentor if he (or she) is to emerge as owner of his own authority" (p. 134).

A number of other investigators also have emphasized the value and benefits of mentoring and sponsoring relationships. Women appear to need mentors at crises or turning points in their careers.

One's success or failure at such times greatly depends upon whether a mentor is present or not. To have a mentor is to be among the blessed. Not to have one is to be damned to eternal oblivion, or at least to a mid-level status. (Halcomb, 1980, p. 13)

Kathryn M. Moore, senior research associate at the Center for the Study of Higher Education, Pennsylvania State University, has studied the careers of 3,000 administrators at 1,200 higher education institutions. Almost 40% admitted to reliance on a mentor sometime during their career climb. Moore said mentors can help individuals gain visibility and access to those at the top. Women interviewed also said that having someone to believe in them was another benefit. Moore said, "Everyone believes that having a mentor lets your career take off" (Chronicle of Higher Education, 1984, p. 29).

Phillips (1977) surveyed 331 women in business and industry. She also interviewed 50 women. Throughout her investigation, Phillips used the term "mentor" to include all those significant others called sponsor, patron, counselor, guide, advisor, employer, coach, advocate, and so on. Her purpose was to explore the effect these significant others had on the careers of women in business and industry. Her dissertation focused on the concept of "career mentoring"--the help given by a mentor to a protege to enable her to reach her goals. Her findings showed that the women ranked a career mentor among the top five critical factors in their career development. Sixty-one percent of the participants indicated they had one or more career mentors.

According to those Phillips surveyed and interviewed, mentors help in several ways. The type of help most often reported was encouragement and recognition of proteges' potential. The second most reported function was teaching proteges about their work and office politics, skills, and other types of training. Mentors also provided opportunities and responsibilities, advice and counsel, help with their careers (hiring, promoting, transferring), visibility, and friendship.

One may conclude that career mentors have played a significant part in the career development of most of the women in this study. Mentors have by no means been the only factor in the women's success, but the mentoring they have received has been an important ingredient in their overall development. (p. 123)

The findings in Villani's (1983) dissertation were similar. She explored the relationships between sponsors, mentors, and mentees in educational administration. In her study, Villani differentiated between mentor and sponsor. She defined a mentor as "a supporter and facilitator of the realization of the Dream . . . a wise and trusted teacher" (p. 97). A sponsor was defined as one

who has influence in the organization, or field, and helps another's career by focusing on their advancement . . . may introduce the protege to other upper level people . . . recommend the protege. This is a relationship of utility, though it does not preclude respect and caring. (p. 97)

As a result of this research, the investigator concluded that mentees see a relationship between their success in overcoming external and internal barriers and the fact they have mentors.

The administrative career support and encouragement provided the women in Villani's study by their mentors was considered the major or "key" contribution of the mentor. Another role mentors play is that



of sponsor. The extent to which they do so depends on their power and influence in their field. Female mentors indicated doubts about their ability to sponsor as effectively as their male counterparts. Those with administrative experience were able to aid in the development of administrative skills and career strategies, whereas those without this experience were not.

Mentors have a subtle influence on their mentees as role models. Villani found that

same gender role modeling was a highly significant influence. This was felt strongly by the mentees and less recognized by their mentors. This is not to say that having a male mentor is a disadvantage. Everyone agreed that it depended on the people involved. (p. 188)

Based on participants' comments in Villani's study, sponsorship referred to help related to obtaining a position or promotion. Functions reported included:

Introductions to people in the field; positive references about the person to others; notification of job openings; help in obtaining job interviews; outstanding recommendations; placement of person on important committees and projects; and appointment to a new position. (p. 122)

Other comments included: He "went to bat for me," "instrumental in getting me a sabbatical," "clearly a sponsor, but he was not a mentor," "put me in contact with people," "publicly made comments that helped my reputation," "there is not the closeness there to call him a mentor" (p. 123).

Villani (1983) stated that there is evidence that "institutionalized sponsorship and administrative training programs can work. While the mentoring relationship appears too unique to mandate, there

are internship and sponsorship programs which are valuable and possible" (p. 184). Others have agreed that true mentoring cannot be structured or institutionalized (Fury, 1980; Orr, 1984).

Missirian (1980) used Business Week's list of the "top 100 corporate women" in the country in 1976 in her study of the mentoring process. Thirty-five women completed surveys, and 15 in-depth interviews were conducted. For Missirian, a mentor is one who shares "the dream." She believes there is an emotional involvement in the true mentoring relationship, a caring relationship that extends beyond the utility of a sponsoring or career-modeling relationship. The sponsor is one who promotes. It is an administrative function, one of utility. The analysis of her data suggested that the mentor assumes a number of supportive roles. These roles range in degrees of power. Peers, coaches, and sponsors do not have the degree of power or influence mentors (the highest point on the continuum) have on their proteges. Missirian reported that mentoring has been a significant part of the career development of successful top-level women managers. In addition, they are becoming mentors themselves.

Keogh's (1982) investigation focused on the extent to which 254 women higher education administrators received sponsorship and whether this sponsorship was perceived as necessary to their careers. Keogh used Shapiro et al.'s conceptual model of sponsoring relationships. Based on the data, the majority of the participants were found to have one or more of the four types of sponsorship. Seventy-five percent of the women reported having a mentor, 58.8% had a sponsor, 62.4% had a

guide, and 76.4% indicated they had a peer pal. Women having such sponsoring relationships agreed that sponsorship is necessary for a successful career and is needed to obtain entry-level positions and promotions and to achieve senior-level positions. They did not agree that sponsorship was as readily available to women as to men.

A greater number of participants in the study reported the presence of a mentor or peer pal than the presence of a sponsor or guide.

The mentor and peer pal relationships represent the two ends of the Shapiro, Haseltine and Rowe continuum of sponsorship. The conclusion is drawn that being a part of a peer pal relationship helps to socialize the administrator into the profession and such a socialization process attracts the attention of a potential mentor who continues the socialization process at a more intense level thus leading the protege to the attention of other potential mentors. (pp. 113-14)

The majority of women (34) in Dressler's (1981) doctoral study were able to obtain a mentor during their professional careers. Seventeen mentors were male and four were female. Thirteen women had both male and female mentors. They acknowledged that politics was played on their campus. "Learning to play the game of politics has been described as one of the requirements for success in any organization" (p. 76). A majority of the women stated that they learned to play the political game through experience and observation. But 9 of the 55 women interviewed credited their mentors with teaching them the game of politics. Thirty-three of the 55 women in the study reported having a sponsor. In general, the administrators indicated that their sponsors "had contacted influential persons on campus and encouraged

consideration of their applications and expounded on their many fine qualities. In some cases small parties were arranged to introduce the candidate to important people on the selection committee" (p. 95).

The central purpose of a study by Cherryholmes (1978) was to compare the career aspirations held by male and female principals. One area of investigation concerned mentoring: Does a mentor play a role in the lives of men and women; are men more likely than women to have a mentor in their professional careers who encourages and guides them? The data showed no significant differences between men and women with regard to the presence or influence of a mentor. The assistance and influence from mentors was almost identical for both sexes. She concluded that the women in her study did not appear to be disadvantaged.

Mills-Novoa (1980) studied 181 women administrators in public and private higher education in Minnesota. Her research focused on factors that affect the career development of women in higher education administration: background factors, perceived institutional influence, career aspirations, and job satisfaction. In her questionnaire, "mentor/sponsor" denoted "a career model who has actively guided and promoted your career." Mills-Novoa's findings on ways mentors/sponsors influence administrators' careers indicated that male mentors/sponsors within the respondent's institution "were able to offer more tangible opportunities, resources and referrals than female mentors/sponsors; whereas female mentors/sponsors seem to have provided more support, direction, etc., than male mentors" (p. 224). She stated, "This

conclusion makes sense in light of the more influential position males tend to hold in the opportunity structure of organizations" (p. 224). It was reported that male mentors provided more limited career guidance than their female counterparts.

For male and female mentors outside the institution, the most frequently cited functions were those of role model and sharing of expertise. Males still were able to provide more tangibles--opportunities, salary, recommendations, and so on.

The number of mentors/sponsors either within or outside the individual's institution did not increase with administrative status as expected. [In fact], the higher the administrative status, the fewer the number of female mentors/sponsors within the individual's present institution. These results raise questions concerning the importance of having a mentor/sponsor in career advancement. (p. 279)

Her findings also suggested that since the factor of educational degree "adds significantly to the predictability of administrative status, . . . women interested in advancing in higher education administration should be strongly encouraged to pursue the terminal degree for their field (i.e., Ph.D., or Ed.D)" (p. 279).

Fury (1980) was cautious. Although she admitted that a good mentor is an asset to an individual's career, she contended that it is still unproven that it is a prerequisite for success. Phillips (1977) added that even though there may be a few indications that the lack of mentors in the lives of some of the women in her study had a negative effect, it cannot yet be said without question that all men and women need career mentors.

Moore (1984) pointed out some possible pitfalls in the use of administrative mentors. As a mentor, "you are trying to pass on to the next generation the things that you value as a leader and a representative of the institution. So you want to maintain in the people you pass it on to a form of control of that leadership style [and] sense of values" (p. 29). She maintained that those considerations could create barriers for individuals who are different from the mentor and others in leadership roles. This is especially true for women and minorities.

Levinson (1978) mentioned a possible problem women may have with a male mentor:

This cross-gender mentoring can be of great value. Its actual value is often limited by the tendency, frequently operating in both of them, to make her less than she is: to regard her as attractive but not gifted, as a gifted woman whose sexual attractiveness interferes with work and friendship, as an intelligent but impersonal pseudomale or as a charming little girl who cannot be taken seriously. (p. 98)

There is a stereotypical barrier women must overcome:

the sponsor's probable belief that women are less committed to a career. The sponsor may therefore not want to train a woman as his successor, preferring a man. Women are seen more often as assistants, not as successors. (Josefowitz, 1980, p. 96)

The "servant trap" poses another problem with mentoring/sponsoring relationships. "Men are used to seeing women serve them, and they may ask you to do all kinds of work that is more fitting for a much younger person or someone in a lower position" (Josefowitz, 1980, p. 97). Sex is another potential risk (Halcomb, 1980; Missirian, 1980; Moore & Salimbene, 1981). Sheehy (1976) addressed this issue:

Female mentors have been particularly scarce and when a man becomes interested in guiding and advising a younger woman, there is usually an erotic interest that goes along with it. . . . The kicker is that the relationship of guide and seeker gets all mixed up with a confusing sexual contract. (p. 132)

The problems cited by women in Villani's (1983) study included dominance by the mentor, thus preventing the mentee from growing; jealousy and charges of favoritism; and obligation or loyalty to the mentor. The problems were not significant enough, however, to end the relationships. Lasden (1985) also cited the resentments and fears the mentoring relationship may cause among peers and colleagues. Resentment can also develop within one's mentor when the protege/mentee equals or surpasses him.

Despite the problems, there are benefits from serving as a mentor. The participants in Villani's (1983) investigation cited the following benefits for the mentor: "professionally helpful," "a chance for growth," personally rewarding, stimulating, and satisfying.

Orr (1984) said that the rewards of mentoring outweigh the risks. "Because they are willing to use, and sometimes risk, their own influence and reputations, mentors can put an indelible stamp on the shape of things to come--not only for the proteges but also for themselves." She felt there is a great deal of satisfaction in helping proteges. Orr asserted that mentors "can profoundly shape the lives of those they help and therein lies the greatest personal satisfaction from serving as a mentor." She admitted this relationship is not without its difficulties such as the time commitment, jealousy, and overdependence. Researchers have suggested that having multiple

mentors can help overcome this problem. She also felt that the important role mentors play in the professional development of the protege is many times ignored by educational institutions, as well as being ignored or neglected by other professional organizations that are looking for new leadership.

Developing strong skills as a mentor causes people to want to work with you. If someone who is staffing a sizeable organization wants to attract bright and competent people, getting a reputation as a really skillful mentor will cause that to happen. (Orr, 1984)

### Literature Concerning Barriers

The barriers affecting advancement can be categorized as either internal or external. Josefowitz (1980) referred to them as internal/external "roadblocks."

Internal roadblocks are those of past socialization (learning what good little girls should or should not be and do), of current expectations (trying to be a Superwoman), and of daily responsibilities (handling a family and a career). The external roadblocks are encounters with prejudice, manifested in stereotyping and ultimately in societal and organizational discrimination, such as unfair hiring and promotional practices. These external roadblocks are due to socialization as well, but not ours--theirs. Most men have been socialized to stereotype women and to discriminate against them. (p. 5)

It is useful to separate the barriers or constraints in this way.

However, it should be remembered that in practice they are not separate, for each influences the other.

Socialization can be defined as the processes through which an individual acquires the thoughts, standards, traditions and behavior patterns of his/her culture (Unger & Denmark, 1975). Sex-role stereotyping means to display or adopt "all or most of the behaviors



traditionally associated with one's sex role, as delineated by one's culture" (Unger & Denmark, 1975, p. 819).

Research has shown that "stereotyping begins at birth and continues with or without the awareness of the parents. Some parents follow socialization purposely. Others try not to, yet are not aware that they give ambiguous signals" (Josefowitz, 1980, p. 13). Josefowitz believed it is almost impossible to free oneself completely of the prejudices and stereotypes instilled by socialization.

"Children quickly categorize themselves as either male or female, and realize the limitations of either role" (Gappa & Uehling, 1979, p. 29). The results of socialization show in the approval girls receive for "feminine behavior" and the approval boys get for "masculine behavior." This approval begins in the home and is reinforced at school and through the media. Boys are trained to be independent, take risks, explore, and experiment. Girls, on the other hand, are encouraged to be dependent, quiet, obedient, careful, and to expect protection from boys (Josefowitz, 1980).

Their childhood experiences as male or female are manifested in adult behavior by differences in achievement, attitudes, and levels of self-esteem. "Thus the woman makes decisions about her future based not only on the opportunities available to her, but on her self-concept, expectations of her future roles and her aspirations" (Gappa & Uehling, 1979, p. 29). Sex-role stereotyping of women as second-class, passive, noncompetitive, and so on, "greatly affects their self-esteem

and achievement motivation as well as men's attitudes regarding women's potential and roles" (p. 30).

Since boys are taught early in life that girls are no competitive match for them, those girls who are, somehow threaten a boy's masculinity. . . . If girls are to be protected, made fun of, humored, taken out, but not taken seriously, no wonder men have difficulty accepting women as colleagues. They have always seen them as mothers, sisters, daughters, teachers, nurses, secretaries--support roles. But there is some evidence that this strong socialization process is changing somewhat, as a result of the women's movement. Certainly there is more rhetoric about breaking down stereotypes. However, the most recent research seems to indicate that although many men speak in terms of equality of the sexes, they still act in discriminatory ways. (Josefowitz, 1980, p. 13)

Unger and Denmark (1975), reviewing a paper presented by Ekstrom, added:

The woman's own attitudes, motivation, and personality variables are often factors that prevent her from pursuing higher education. Ekstrom notes that in high school women students are rewarded for being passive, dependent, and avoiding conflict while in college aggressiveness, competitiveness, and independence are rewarded. Thus, she says, a woman is constantly battling between the old behaviors and the new. Ekstrom notes that the socialization process women receive encourages them to develop personalities that are at odds with those characteristics needed for obtaining a higher education. In addition, women are taught that they are intellectually inferior to men. (p. 643)

Schmuck (1975) referred to the effect of socialization on men and women in her investigation of school administration: "A strong cultural norm exists in educational administration which encourages men to seek managerial positions and discourages women from seeking managerial positions in the public schools" (p. 340). She identified three deterrents to women seeking administrative posts in the schools:

1. Women's traditional role in the family places restrictions on their freedom in careers.

2. Also, regardless of marital status or familial status, women have more self-doubts and lack of confidence about their ability to hold an administrative position. Thus, they are reluctant to aspire to positions of authority and responsibility. "One of the most formidable barriers to women's entrance and advancement in managerial positions is their own lack of self-confidence, their self-deprecation, and their doubts about their ability to do a good job" (pp. 342-43). A frequent response to requests to accept jobs with power and responsibility is, "Who, me?"

3. "The response of 'Who, me?' is certainly influenced by women's traditional social position in the society of deferring to men in situations involving social power. Women are not expected to pursue successful leadership careers, and those who strive for positions of influence and power are considered exceptions" (p. 344). Almost every man or woman school administrator Schmuck interviewed in her study agreed that women must be "smarter, more competent, and more capable" than men in order to obtain administrative posts. Many women felt compelled to prove their worth. The expectations that she must become a Superwoman were self-imposed, as well as communicated by men.

Her findings led Schmuck to conclude that "clearly, the traditional roles of males and females in our society have a direct impact upon women's and men's pursuits of managerial careers in any field" (p. 345).

Wolman and Frank (1975) added that feminine socialization trains women to value passivity, helplessness, and show of feelings.

If she wishes to succeed in the professions, she must reevaluate these "feminine" traits and become, instead, independent, assertive, and competent.

Bickel (1980) asserted that "socialization patterns of our society are among the primary causes for many difficulties women experience in entering and being promoted within professional ranks" (p. 9). And Abramson (1975) quoted Jo Freeman as labeling the socialization process "the most insidious mechanism of social control yet devised" (p. 114). Yet Abramson disagreed with Freeman:

The reason there are so few qualified women, one explanation would have us believe, is that early socialization has forever damned women to a secondary and supportive role in society. . . . Unfortunately, the socialization theory is not a completely satisfying explanation. No one stands still forever, and no woman is fixed forever by her childhood. (p. 115)

As women continue to have experiences in the world, some stressful and unrewarding, they will reexamine their feelings about themselves. For those choosing careers in the academic world and elsewhere, by so choosing those careers they also choose behavior that "deviates from the dictates of the socialization process" (p. 115).

The socialization theory, Abramson continued, although an inadequate explanation for the lack of women working in higher education, "remains remarkably persistent." It provides administrators an excuse for why few women wish to be employed in higher education, as well as a handy rationalization for women who "made it" when explaining why so many others have not.

Given this rationalization, the facts provided by the working situation can be put to use as proof in a self-fulfilling prophecy. There are few women in permanent career positions in the academic

world; ergo, there are few women who want or are capable of gaining positions in the academic world; ergo, the socialization process has been effective in seeing to it that few women want or are capable of gaining positions in the academic world; ergo, there are few women in permanent career positions in the academic world.

This particular bit of circular reasoning neatly does away with discrimination, at least discrimination in higher education. It is all back there in early childhood. But it fails to explain a few things. What about those women who want positions in the academic world and cannot get them? And what about those women who have positions in the academic world and are not satisfied that they are being fairly treated in them? The socialization theory simply fails to explain all these deviants. (pp. 115-16)

Some researchers have conducted studies in which the existence of sex-role stereotypes was supported. Among them, Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman, and Broverman (1968) and Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson, and Rosenkrantz (1972) have shown that there is agreement concerning the differing traits of men and women.

### Internal Barriers

#### Marriage/family responsibilities.

Women and men who balance family and career, who juggle earning a degree at night with work and/or family, whose energies must be spread over several equally important endeavors, are in the bind of constantly having to choose one over the other. . . . If the attempt is made to do everything equally well (The Superwoman or Superman), the price for it is paid in terms of exhaustion and no time for leisure, for relationships, or for oneself. (Josefowitz, 1980, p. 125)

Many women entering the workforce are among the "multicommitted." Balancing the traditional commitments to family and the other commitment to a career has become a crucial issue for women with this dual responsibility, according to Josefowitz. She expressed the opinion that marriage and family responsibilities influence women much more critically than their male counterparts.

Most husbands tend to pursue their careers independent of their family situations, except perhaps for taking fewer risks when there is a family to feed. Whether their wives have children at age 20 or 35 will make relatively little difference to their careers. For women, it will make all the difference. . . . In other words, her family situation will dictate her options much more than ever has been the case for men. (Josefowitz, 1980, pp. 125-26)

Palley (1978) surveyed 168 men and 40 women alumni of the Academic Administration Internship Program of the American Council on Education. They responded to questions concerning career-mobility patterns, personal and professional background characteristics, and perceptions of discrimination against women based on sex. She found that family responsibilities did not appear to interfere with the career mobility of men; however, they did so to the detriment of women. Palley attributed this as possibly the result of sex-role socialization--home and family responsibilities being primarily the woman's domain, regardless of whether or not she works outside the home. Palley noted:

There was an apparent inverse relationship between marriage and family obligations and administrative career mobility among women respondents; there was no such relationship of this variable to administrative career mobility apparent for the male respondents. The limiting role of marriage and family responsibilities for women becomes apparent. (p. 8)

Several married women commented that their career patterns were curtailed by the careers of their husbands. No men mentioned any career limitations due to their wives' professional goals.

However, whatever the cause, it is a reality that family responsibility altered career patterns for women with career goals in academic administration in ways in which they do not affect men. It is therefore necessary to conclude that even if discrimination based on sex is not a manifest function in contemporary colleges and universities, it remains a very colorful link in function. (p. 9)

Interrupted careers due to pregnancy, family responsibilities, or career moves of husbands were identified as major barriers in Gasser's (1975) investigation. About one-fourth of the 434 upper-level and lower-level higher education administrators felt that inability to relocate and interrupted employment due to pregnancy or family responsibilities were serious barriers to career advancement.

Subjects in Banfield's (1976) study were split on the question of being equally professionally mobile as a man. Banfield commented:

Whereas it is generally agreed that professional mobility is an important factor in advancement for men in the business world, most subjects agreed that this was not the case for women. A woman makes the greatest strides by establishing herself within an organization and staying where she was known. (p. 92)

In Davis's (1978) study, 88.1% of the respondents admitted that the problem of the time demands of both family and career responsibilities existed for them. More than 60% agreed that there were insufficient pregnancy benefits and policies, which serves as a limitation for the younger women who wish to combine family and career. Women in both Bickel's (1980) and Pacheco's (1982) studies also reported conflict created by the dual responsibility of career and marriage. Likewise, public school superintendents surveyed by Ott (1983) believed that families interfere with a woman's career and with her job performance.

Tyler (1979) found that those respondents who had married and had children viewed marriage as a help and children as both a help and a hindrance to career development. Marriage and children delayed the achievement of their first administrative position.

Quite different findings were reported by other investigators. Giggelman (1978) investigated demographic and personal characteristics of women administrators and teachers in community colleges. She concluded that marriage was not a constraint to a career in either administration or teaching for these women. It was found that women in administration usually come from the ranks of teaching. The only barriers to administration were found to be the limited number of available positions and possibly women's lack of desire.

Only two married women student personnel administrators in Schlack's (1974) study mentioned that "they found it difficult to mesh their professional life with their home life" (p. 91).

The data in Fisher's (1978) dissertation did not indicate that the responsibility of children lessened teachers' desire to obtain administrative positions. A majority of the men and women disagreed that they had too many family responsibilities to seek an administrative position. A majority of both the men and women disagreed that family responsibilities were an obstacle to their seeking an administrative post (68% men; 55% women). In addition, 86% of the men and 88% of the women agreed that a woman can be happily married and be a successful administrator at the same time.

Douglas (1976) examined demographic characteristics and career patterns of women administrators in higher education. Her findings led her to conclude that "contrary to widely held beliefs . . . women administrators do not have periods of career discontinuance, but instead maintain continuous employment and dedication to one



institution" (p. 4). Eighty-one percent of all administrators had no periods of unemployment, but the most frequent reason given for "career discontinuance" was family responsibility. The suggestion has been made that because married women have the prime responsibility of managing the household and rearing children, they are not as productive professionally as men or single female colleagues (Gappa & Uehling, 1979). However, data collected by Ferber and Loeb (1973) refuted this. The findings of their study, involving 278 men and women at the Urbana-Champaign campus of the University of Illinois, indicated that

Marital and parental status are not the bars to productivity by women that they are often assumed to be. . . . Married women with or without children are no less productive than single ones, yet appear to experience less success in academic life. (pp. 999, 1001)

A later study by Freeman (1977) substantiated the findings of Ferber and Loeb. No difference was found in the rates of publication between married and single women. Freeman did find, however, that married men published more than single men.

Abramson (1975) pointed out that administrators must begin taking risks with women:

They must stop assuming that marriage, babies, homemaking, future disinterest in the field, unproven research ability, and so forth, will prevent success for a woman. Such considerations, after all, are not assumed to prevent success for a man. Yet men get married, become fathers, maintain homes, may lose interest in their fields, and may never demonstrate research ability. (p. 230)

The expectation of complete loyalty and commitment to the business organization was noted by Kanter (1977). This concern for dedication may serve to exclude many women from management positions. "Women have been assumed not to have the dedication of men to their

work, or they have been seen to have conflicting loyalties, competing pulls from their other relationships" (pp. 66-67). Women at Indsco experienced contradictory messages on the issue of marriage--that for some women being single was an advantage and for others it was just the opposite. A few were told that

they could not be given important jobs because they were likely to get married and leave. . . . On the other hand, they were also told in other circumstances that married women cannot be given important jobs because of their family responsibilities: their children, if they are working mothers; their unborn children and the danger they will leave with pregnancy, if currently childless. (p. 67)

A male manager, a supervisor of many women, confirmed these reports.

He said that he never even considered asking a married woman to do anything that involved travel, even if this was in the interests of her career development, and therefore he could not see how he could recommend a woman for promotion into management. (p. 67)

A recent survey of executive women in industry and business substantiated some of the comments made by Kanter. One of the most frequently mentioned barriers was the attitude that women will run off and get married. In addition, "more than half of the executive women who are divorced say their career played a part in the separation" (Hull, 1982, p. 29). In a similar study by James Baron he noted, "Not only is being married a disadvantage to a woman in that position, but it's an asset for a man" (Hull, 1982, p. 29). An additional difference between men and women executives is mobility. Although 33% of the female respondents were asked to relocate, only 21% had done so (Hull, 1982).

Other internal barriers. Gasser (1975) reported that less than one-quarter of the respondents in her study had actively sought a

higher-level position. Concern about their ability to handle the conflict and responsibility of the job, and the belief that their application would not be seriously considered, kept them from applying for advancement.

The majority of respondents (82.9%) in Davis's (1978) study indicated that another problem for the woman in administration is that women do not aspire to high-level administrative posts as readily as do men and thus do not prepare themselves through training and education for these leadership positions. Davis suggested that this may be due to their early socialization.

Women executives in business and industry "attribute their successes to ambition, drive and a willingness to take risks, and they blame their failures on a male world and their lack of confidence in it" (Hull, 1982, p. 29). After "being a woman," the most frequently mentioned barrier to success was lack of confidence. One female executive mentioned she had to overcome the fear she was not as good or strong as her male colleagues because of lack of education and being the first woman. Another mentioned "myself" as the greatest career challenge. Barbara Franklin, Senior Fellow of Public Management of the University of Pennsylvania Wharton School, blamed isolation and upbringing as reasons for this insecurity--"Women aren't brought up with male egos" (Hull, 1982, p. 29).

An additional potential barrier--caretaking, a problem facing many women today--was the topic of a report by Hull (1985).

Caretaking--caring for aging parents--has traditionally been women's responsibility.

Elaine Brody, an expert on aging at the Philadelphia Geriatric Center, used the phrase "women in the middle" to describe middle-aged women torn by the conflicting responsibilities of parent care, child care, role of wife, and her career. Brody was quoted as saying that caring for parents is still a "gender-assigned task." Thus, even though many women today have full-time careers, when parents need help it is usually the woman who must balance marriage, career, and caretaking. A 1982 federal government study reported that 33% of the 6,400 surveyed indicated they received help from a daughter, while only 17% reported help from a son. Daughters also, more than sons, are more likely to provide those laborious, day-to-day tasks such as transportation, shopping, housekeeping, and so on (Hull, 1985).

What is the effect of such responsibility? Hull (1985) stated,

The issue of parent care comes as many women are struggling to make changes in their own work status or trying to return to work after raising children. But often, caring for a parent results in cutting down on hours at work or even quitting jobs. (p. 21)

Some women reported feeling tied down and felt "as though they were missing something in life" (p. 21). Hull continued:

Lost career opportunities are only one of the risks associated with parent care. In most cases, dealing with an ailing parent also involves stress, strain and emotional hardship. Many women suffer guilt and a feeling of isolation, partly due to lack of support from siblings. (p. 21)

One such caregiver indicated that they pat her on the back and say "good work, I'm glad I don't have to do it" (p. 21). Hull indicated

that the conflict between career and parent care will get worse because the population of elderly is growing.

### External Barriers

Numerous investigators have suggested that it is difficult for women to gain entrance to, advance within, and achieve top-level positions in administration or management due to societal and organizational barriers. A few authors have used the general term "sex discrimination" to describe the barriers encountered. A number of researchers have identified specific sex-role stereotypes and attitudes as constraints to professional mobility and advancement.

Women in higher education administration. Stevenson (1973), investigating factors relating to the employment level of 327 women administrators in Big Ten universities, found that women attributed their lack of advancement to sheer discrimination, lack of assertiveness, interrupted careers, the lack of a sponsor, and failure to unite to improve their situation. The factors they felt contributed to these were socialization of both men and women, women's "rejection of responsibility or the administrative position, and men's support of other men, not women" (pp. 184-85). They perceived that they did not have the open, continuous, and informal communication with their superiors that allows for awareness of events, courses of action, and "influence in final decision making" (p. 149).

Women are becoming more aware of the need to support each other professionally. Respondents were "almost totally lacking in the long-term genuine concern by a powerful person which results in open doors,

optimum development and advancement and is called sponsorship" (p. 149). Some comments referring to employment conditions included statements to the effect that discrimination exists but is very subtle. Others stated that women were not taken seriously and that women were not viewed as individuals sufficiently capable of assuming managerial posts. Others mentioned that a woman needs more ability to advance than a man, a woman must be twice as good as a man to hold an administrative position, and a woman must work harder.

Stevenson noted that women in the Big Ten are not alone in their observation that "in meetings with men, a woman's comments often seem to be only tolerated and not really listened to or respected" (p. 174). Big Ten women were also aware of their exclusion from male informal activities (such as luncheons) where "shop talk" takes place, according to Stevenson.

Young (1974) examined the opinions of deans and faculty members regarding the effectiveness of women departmental chairpersons. Among her findings was that older persons (combined faculty and deans) in the academic environment may be more accepting of the female in administration. There was no statistically significant difference, however, between the opinions of male and female faculty members. Women faculty members viewed the effectiveness of women chairpersons more positively than did the men.

Schlack (1974) asked women student personnel administrators, "What would you consider your major problem as a woman administrator?" Many (46.6%) reported that

they were not taken seriously; thought of as a woman first and an administrator second; not included in the informal, but important decision-making circles; not considered seriously as career-oriented; seldom considered for jobs outside female-oriented fields; not considered an equal by male administrators; and overtly discriminated against in salaries and promotions. (p. 90)

Schetlin (1975) identified what she referred to as the "Big Daddy/Little Woman syndrome." This designation represents the expectation that the woman should play a supportive, nurturant role to the administrative man. She also encountered what she labeled the "Boys Ploy." As defined by Schetlin, users of this ploy redefine as less valuable those tasks that are accomplished by a woman, or credit the man with her successes.

Hollon and Gemmill (1976) conducted a study to establish whether and how male and female faculty members differ in perceived participation in decision making, job involvement, job-related tension, and overall job satisfaction. Three hundred twenty-one community college faculty members participated in the study. Female faculty members reported experiencing less perceived participation in decision making. This appears to support the proposition that "females generally have less power in organizations than males" (p. 89). Women also reported

significantly less influence over their job situation and greater difficulty in getting their ideas across to their superiors than their male counterparts. Women professionals report, also, being less influential on their superiors' decisions and less frequently consulted by their superiors than men professionals. However, statistical significance is not reached in either case. (pp. 85-86)

To explain these differences, the investigators suggested that possibly

overt and covert forms of sex discrimination might have minimized in this study the participation of female professionals in decision making and might have affected adversely their job involvement, job related tension, and overall job satisfaction. (p. 91)

However, the data provided insufficient information to arrive at any conclusive findings relative to the investigators' tentative explanations.

Davis's (1978) research was designed to determine the characteristics and the advantages and problems of the female administrator in large southeastern higher education institutions in 1977. She found that women did not hold the top-level administrative positions. For the most part, they remained in middle management. A number of advantages unique to women administrators were cited, including the opportunity to serve as a role model for other aspiring female administrators. A number of personal qualities were acknowledged--sensitivity, calmness, understanding, and attention to detail.

A number of problems were also perceived for the female administrator. Seventy-five percent of the respondents felt the fact that women do not have the same type of network as men ("good old boy" system) to obtain information on job and promotional opportunities was obstructive to the advancement of women in administration. And the "good old boy" network was recognized as a problem by 76.3% of the participants.

Too many stereotypical female roles was recognized as a problem by almost all (90.8%) of the respondents. A majority (80.2%) of the respondents agreed that the limited number of top female administrators provided few role models and mentors. Davis suggested that "lacking



the encouragement and guidance of mentors, many young women fail to attain the positions or promotions that such assistance fosters" (p. 182).

Seventy-five percent of the women agreed that "women in leadership positions have to work twice as hard and do twice as good a job as their male counterparts to 'prove' themselves" (p. 182). A majority of women (77.6%) concurred that opportunities to gain experience are limited, and thus positions requiring experience, including "power" positions, are difficult for women to obtain. More than half (56.6%) felt that women's lack of experience for their administrative jobs is a problem. Almost as many (55.3%) felt that if a woman is not "accepted as a colleague by her male associates, she faces serious obstacles which may impede her effectiveness" (p. 185).

In addition, 65.8% of the respondents agreed that women "must be more accomplished and smarter than men to get the same position" (p. 185). A majority (85.6%) believed that there still are considerable salary discrepancies between men and women and that a lack of acceptance by some with whom women must work is a problem. Women recognized that a subtle form of discrimination exists, making it difficult for women to succeed, according to 69.7% of the participants. "Deliberate omission"--from information, exclusion from meetings, from committee assignments--is a problem resulting in their lack of representation in decision-making activities of the institution.

In a survey of women administrators in Illinois public community colleges, Lenny (1980) attempted to explain the reasons for the scarcity of women in such positions. Internal and external constraints preventing women from reaching their potential were revealed. Women failed to aggressively seek high positions, waiting instead to be discovered. Male administrators made little effort to provide opportunities through mentoring relationships. In addition, women did not have access to the "old boy" network.

Stokes (1981) surveyed women in administrative positions in Florida's state universities to identify the nature and extent of barriers that affect their careers; to explore the relationships between these constraints and their professional-development needs, administrative style, and future aspirations; and to examine the effect of these constraints. Twenty-three barriers were selected from the literature. One hundred sixty-eight women responded to the survey.

Stokes found that these constraints that hinder the advancement of women were perceived to be quite extensive in the state university system of Florida. When the responses to "often" and "occasionally encountered" were combined, Stokes found that 19 of the 23 items were experienced by 50% or more of the respondents. Almost 87% said they occasionally or often had to "work twice as hard and expend more energy than the average man in order to succeed," while 88.9% agreed that "women have less access to power." Almost 87% felt that "an informal system of collegial relationships for information sharing and decision making excludes women." Another 81.2% found it "difficult to receive

recognition," 74% indicated they were "ignored during important discussions," and 71.6% indicated they served as a "mother figure." About 67% felt they were "cast as a sex object," while 60.7% believed "they have been passed over for promotion because they are not 'strong enough, too emotional, etc.' yet men with similar disqualifications are selected."

Additional barriers experienced by women administrators as reported by Stokes included: "less influence on decision-making," "less frequently consulted," and "interrupted in group discussions." Almost one-half (47.9%) reported that overt and covert sexual harassment was a problem, and almost 60% reported that the higher women advance, the greater the barriers to success.

Nancy Milburn, early member of the Committee for the Concerns of Women in New England Colleges and Universities, stated,

We are beginning to realize that the further women rise in higher education, the higher the barriers to their success become. As women begin to take leading positions, all of a sudden men perceive them as real competitors, not just as women, and they become more threatening. (Stent, 1978, p. 20)

Karr (1983) found that 69% of the women in her study felt that men advanced faster in administration with less experience because they were men. Only 44% of the men felt that way. Seventy-four percent of the women believed that the "white male club" promoted men over women to administrative positions. Only 45% of the men agreed with this statement. A majority (79%) of the men surveyed believed they were chosen more often than women for administrative positions. A significant number of faculty women agreed with the statement that

women administrators "have less power to make decisions than men" (p. 183).

Pulliam (1984) used fieldwork methods to discover how women deans perceive and carry out their administrative roles. This type of study provided a close-up view of the behavioral patterns of women administrators. The investigator discovered that the deans, as administrators at institutions with a disproportionately greater number of male administrators, saw themselves as "isolates" or outsiders in administration in their institutions. One of the factors found to influence their role as administrator was the stereotypes men colleagues held of women administrators. One administrator complained that she must contend with sexist remarks.

Another problem mentioned was the exclusion from the informal network formed by male administrators. Men manage through these networks, and some decisions are made in this informal setting that affect the female administrator's department or division. One female administrator said that men made decisions outside of meetings and she then had to be "filled in" later. As a consequence, the woman administrator is excluded from the discussions as well as from the decision making.

Other complaints by participants included "being ignored when present at some meetings" (p. 203) and being excluded from meetings involving policy and procedures related to the administrator's area. One trait found in the administrative behavior of all the deans was that of "nurturance." While the image of the dean as a "mother figure"

was appreciated by some of the staff, other staff members reacted negatively.

On the other hand, one researcher found barriers faced by women managers and executives to be conspicuously lacking in their experiences. Dressler (1981) interviewed 55 top-level women administrators in two- and four-year colleges in San Diego County, California. The women felt feminine in their roles, felt they were taken seriously by men, experienced no sexual harassment, had not been denied promotions due to their sex, and had been provided equal opportunity to gain administrative experience. They perceived themselves as powerful and influential. They had a mentor during their careers, and a sponsor helped a majority of the women attain their current position. However, one barrier they did cite was the existence of the "old boys' club." As a result, they felt they were "excluded from the benefits of equal access to information, support, and resources available through acceptance in the 'club'" (p. 120).

Several investigators have noted positive as well as negative factors affecting women's careers. The women in Gasser's (1975) study reported that few faculty women were available to serve as role models or mentors. They cited widespread sex discrimination in recruiting, hiring, and promotion practices. They felt they were excluded from formal and informal "collegial associations," which they believed prevented them from fully participating in or contributing to their institution. A number of the participants claimed they "were 'not accepted as peers' by their colleagues" (p. 102). They said they were

excluded from "informal communication channels' which could provide the needed support in a new position" (p. 102).

Positive influences included attendance at management and administrative seminars. More than half of all respondents participated in these seminars. However, very few women had participated in administrative internship programs. A majority believed that willingness to assume extra responsibility was a primary factor in their career advancement. Institutional affirmative action policies, however, were cited by only a minority of respondents as a primary positive influence.

Piggott's (1979) attempted to identify the major factors that influence the positions, ranks, and salaries of women administrators in North Carolina colleges and universities. Subjects from 45 colleges and universities participated. Data supported the hypothesis that women believed they were discriminated against. More women were employed in Category II positions (directors, head librarians) than in Category I (presidents, vice-presidents, deans). Very few women held the positions of president, vice-president, or dean. Among 245 participants, there were only nine deans of women.

Among the barriers to advancement as perceived by women administrators, sex discrimination received the highest number of responses. Women believed that sex discrimination exists in hiring and promoting at their present institution. A large percentage of women were satisfied with their present positions; a high percentage did not wish to move from their present locale. Key factors that facilitated

advancement in careers included early career planning, proper educational credentials, and experience. On-the-job training was ranked the highest among experiences valued by women administrators.

Responses in the personal interviews and to the questionnaire elicited similar information. The investigator noted,

male chauvinism, not sex discrimination, was the prevailing reference to barriers to advancement. Those interviewed indicated that chauvinism appears to be more subtle and unconscious than overt sex discrimination, but the results are equally devastating. (p. 170)

Woods (1979) surveyed 201 women administrators and faculty women in two- and four-year public institutions in Michigan. Her study focused on the personal, educational, and professional characteristics of women administrators and faculty; factors that influenced their career development; and the identification of barriers and other factors they had experienced in their career development. The majority of both faculty women and administrators had no aspirations for a higher-level position than the one they currently held in their present institution. The majority of both groups indicated that their present position was their highest career goal.

Factors that were cited as influencing their career development included contact with a career woman, support from a supervisor, acceptance of extra responsibility, association with professional organizations, and appointment to or involvement on university committees. A number of faculty and administrators indicated that affirmative action did not serve as a positive influence in their careers. However, this attitude was reflected more among Caucasian women than

among minority women. The majority of both groups, faculty and administrators, did not indicate that there were barriers to their career development.

Bickel (1980) investigated strategies for and barriers to employment and advancement identified by women doctoral students in higher education and student personnel administration. Study participants included 289 women. Bickel concluded that a greater number of women are now seeking upper-level positions--33% aspired to dean and 43% aspired to vice-president or president within 10 years--than in past surveys.

The "old boy" network was identified as a barrier. Difficulties resulting from this network included: "(1) not having access to information necessary to do the best job; (2) not being close to persons from whom they could learn; and (3) not being visible to persons who might help them advance in the field" (p. 76). Respondents felt "it is quite impossible to penetrate the informal structure which exists in most higher educational organizations" (p. 76). However, they were aware of the "importance of the relationships formed within those informal systems to their careers" (p. 76). The respondents perceived themselves as coping with more barriers than men.

Respondents reported competency as an important strategy for advancement. They suggested gaining and demonstrating competency by obtaining proper credentials--the highest degree; specializing; gaining teaching experience; knowing the field, job, and institution; and developing political savvy. Another strategy mentioned was developing



and maintaining professional support through participation in professional organizations, developing networking, and obtaining mentors and female role models.

In her study of top-level California community college women administrators, Moore (1983) found that there was a trend toward career planning. Women ranked being competent and having drive as the most helpful factors in their career development. They ranked having a mentor or sponsor as sixth.

Women in educational administration. The findings from research on women in public school administration have been similar to those on higher education. Harris (1976) reported that her data largely supported the conclusions drawn from previous studies. Almost all the executive women described instances of what they perceived as biased attitudes toward women administrators. The investigator offered the following as examples:

decision-making by males who excluded the female executive educator when key issues were to be decided; . . . subtleties of seating arrangements and use of titles: women are spoken to using their first name, while males are addressed by title; . . . sex-stereotypes behavior toward the executive educator in terms of the kinds of responsibilities she is assigned by peers. (pp. 54-55)

In almost all cases, the position of superintendent was offered; she did not actively seek the position.

A study by Way (1976) of 327 public school principals and program specialists revealed differences in the perception of male and female respondents on constraints to career advancement. A greater percentage of female administrators felt that sex discrimination was a

barrier, whereas a larger percentage of male administrators perceived that lack of education, training, and experience was a barrier.

Capps (1976) surveyed 306 supervisors and 176 assistant superintendents (both male and female) of North Carolina public schools. On the basis of the data collected, she found little evidence to indicate that women supervisors wishing to move into higher levels of administration in North Carolina public schools were victims of sex discrimination.

Fisher (1978) surveyed a random sample of 400 men and women teachers in Michigan. She examined the relationship between the scarcity of women in educational administration and the administrative career aspirations of women teachers. The study was designed to determine the factors teachers perceived as barriers to obtaining positions in educational administration. According to the findings, "as the responsibility of the administrative position increased, the aspiration level of women educators decreased" (p. 131). Women's aspirations appeared to be much less than indicated in other studies. Fisher concluded from the results that a very small percentage of all teachers--male and female--had any desire to leave teaching for administration. Fifty-seven percent of the women (compared to 40% of the men) agreed with the statement that men advance faster in administration with less experience simply because they are men. And slightly more women (75%) than men (72%) agreed that men are more often chosen for an administrative post than women.

The purpose of the study by Pacheco (1982) was to identify the barriers to career advancement as perceived by 342 women public school administrators in California, as well as to identify those barriers perceived as the greatest obstacles to advancement. On the basis of her findings, Pacheco concluded that barriers exist for women who wish to enter and/or advance in educational administration. The most serious obstacles women face were identified as the absence of an "old boy" network, sponsorship and support systems for women, the lack of geographic mobility, and the "lack of awareness of the political maneuvers necessary within the administrative structure" (p. 172).

Additional barriers cited in addition to those on Pacheco's questionnaire were in the category of discrimination--discrimination based on gender, race, and ethnicity. The comments "women must work twice as hard" and "women must be twice as good as men" were made frequently in her study when respondents were asked to report any additional barriers to women's entrance into or advancement in educational administration.

No significant differences were found in the perceptions of barriers among women holding various positions in the administrative hierarchy. No correlation was found between age of respondents and barriers perceived, nor with years in administration. Women did, however, rate external barriers (those over which they have no direct control--those emanating from society and the structure of the organization) as more serious barriers to advancement in educational administration than internal barriers (those that come from within

themselves). The majority of women in this study aspired to advance in their careers. Both the informal and formal organizational structure were perceived to hold serious obstacles to women's advancement in administration.

Ott's (1983) research was an attempt to discover if any patterns of subconscious bias or discrimination toward women existed on the part of public school superintendents that might hinder their access to executive positions in public schools. Eleven favorable beliefs toward women administrators were expressed, among them: "women have good professional skills, are more open in communication than men, and women have good personal characteristics" (p. 111). Participants believed there were no distractions on the job due to women's femininity--attractiveness, dress, and so on.

Participants also expressed 29 negative beliefs about women. "Women were found to have skills required for staff positions but skills required for line positions were perceived as lacking in women" (p. 1v). "Skills required for line positions are good decision-making ability, experience at levels where one has to cope with difficult situations, and academic preparation for administration" (pp. 61-62). Participants felt women lacked these skills.

Ott concluded: "The inference, therefore, is that the beliefs regarding professional skills of women coupled with the above can keep women in staff positions of support and can prevent them from entering the line positions" (p. 62). They believed that woman's exclusion from the "good old boy" network was detrimental to her career. They

also believed that women need to prove themselves more than men and that they are not respected professionally as much as men. They felt that women "lack knowledge of the political aspects of educational administration" (p. 59). Ott concluded that the findings revealed "a pattern of subconscious bias against female applicants for administrative positions" (p. 60).

Women in administration/management outside education.

According to Hennig and Jardim (1981),

In general the stereotype of the woman executive is unfeminine--she is supposed to be aggressive, masculine, hard, cold and undesirable to men. A proposition developed from such a point of view would state that a successful woman cannot be a successful executive and a successful woman executive cannot be a successful woman. Many men--and women--implicitly believe this. (p. 74)

Matteson (1976) examined the attitudes held by men and women toward women in managerial positions. An attitude instrument, women as managers scale, was one of several instruments administered to 108 management-level employees in health services organizations. The results indicated that females held more favorable attitudes toward women in management positions. More interestingly, the data suggested that, irrespective of age and sex, the more experience a person had the less positive his/her attitude toward the female as manager. Matteson raised some interesting questions. Do the less positive attitudes toward women reflect sex differences--do women make less effective managers and thus attitudes toward them in these roles are less positive? Or is the explanation due to women adopting stereotypic roles? Are less positive attitudes toward women in management roles associated with discriminatory behaviors? Do women who hold less

positive attitudes discriminate against other women as do men? And what is the effect of these attitudes on behavior?

Women middle managers in Banfield's (1976) study cited several problems they encounter that are unique to women. Half of the respondents reported having to overcome traditional role stereotypes. Another problem noted was the "difficulty of men in adjusting to working with women in professional roles." Some elaborated, saying "men do not take women seriously"; two-thirds said "a woman has to work twice as hard and perform at a higher level than a man to prove herself" (p. 105). Another problem cited was that a woman with the same qualifications as a man must continually prove she can do the job; it is assumed that the man can do it.

One-fourth of the managers reported that success was "very often a combination of being at the right place at the right time and being ready" (p. 95). Others claimed that even though there were women in the company in responsible positions, the organization imposes a level above which they are not allowed to rise. Banfield suggested that it may--as one participant suggested--be a reflection of a "subtle pattern for keeping women outside the mainstream of the established power structure while meeting the equal opportunity requirements of the law" (p. 105).

The majority of women managers believed an informal structure existed in their organizations from which they were excluded. They agreed their lack of participation or involvement was detrimental to

them. Banfield concluded that the most formidable obstacle to women managers involved these traditional sex-role stereotypes.

Josefowitz (1980) cited some of the same problems: women have to work harder, women must work harder to receive the same pay, and sexual harassment. In addition, she pointed out that women are seen as sex objects--an attitude so pervasive, so familiar, so deeply ingrained in the male culture.

In studying the organizational climate, Kanter (1977) also identified stereotypical role traps imposed on women--those of "mother," "seductress," "pet," and "iron maiden." Women often found it easier to accept these roles than to fight them.

Hennig and Jardim (1981) pointed out a basic problem for women in organizations--the issue of the "fit between others' concept of a particular woman and their concept of the executive role" (p. 70).

Because the executive role is seen by many people (men and women) as an exclusively male role, no matter who the particular woman is, she is first and foremost regarded as a woman. As a consequence, in all too many instances and because of fundamental identity issues there is little perceived fit between her and the executive position.

This is a problem which men in organizations never have to face. A man may perceive that others fail to see him as the right person for a particular job, but he never faces the problem that he is not the person for the job because he is a man. She, in contrast, has often been "not the person for the job" because she is a woman and little consideration has ever been given to the damage done to her self-confidence when she is forced to confront the negative fit. (pp. 70-71)

In a 1984 Wall Street Journal/Gallup survey, 722 female executives holding titles of vice-president or higher expressed mixed feelings about the men with whom they worked. Some indicated they had been helped by men, whereas others indicated they had been obstructed

by male attitudes or prejudices. Those indicating their preference for a male boss said that men were less emotional, more professional and businesslike, and fairer.

Two-thirds of the female executives mentioned one or more advantages to being a woman, while four out of five cited a number of disadvantages. The most frequently cited disadvantage was the prevalence of male chauvinism. One executive stated that in upper-level management women were still not taken seriously and that women were considered subservient. Nearly half of the women stated that men in the organization treated them differently--71% stating that this treatment was negative and 26% stating that it was positive. Some of the women complained that women were sometimes bypassed for promotions or positions for reasons having no relationship to their qualifications.

In reply to the question "Have you ever felt that you were being paid less than a male of equal ability?" 70% answered "yes." When asked if they "had the impression that your views were not respected as much as a man's in certain areas," 60% replied "yes."

When asked if they had ever "been mistaken for a secretary at a business meeting," 61% replied in the affirmative; "felt cut off from social conversations or activities among your male colleagues"--60%; "felt you were being patronized by older executives"--44%. Forty-one percent "felt that a male subordinate resisted taking orders" from them "because he felt threatened by a female boss"; and 41% felt that they were being judged more on the basis of dress and appearance than a man



in their position would be." Thirty-four percent said "they would like more clout"--that is, "they want their jobs and their influence in the corporation to more accurately match their formal titles" (Rogan, 1984).

Former U.N. Ambassador Jeanne Kirkpatrick concluded after serving four years as one of the few prominent women in the White House: "Sexism is alive" (Mayer, 1985, p. 1). Some of the women still working in the reorganized, post-1984 election White House agreed, suggesting that women are losing some of the gains made. Inside the White House, positions held by women have increased at the lower ranks. Women have attained, however, prominent government positions outside the White House. Many White House women are exhilarated and pleased with their jobs. But they also complain of double standards. And Kathy Wilson, a former president of the National Women's Political Caucus, contended that there is, especially within the White House, a "bank teller syndrome." She added, "Women can be seen, but don't matter" (Mayer, 1985, p. 1).

FTC Commissioner Bailey stated that "if the President isn't believed to support or promote equal opportunity for women, then no one else will" (Mayer, 1985, p. 25). A former White House worker indicated that before the 1984 election, they were sensitive to placing women in high positions. Presently, however, she feels that women are allowed to rise to only a certain level, "but if they feel you're likely to reach your full potential they go after you" to prevent it (Mayer, 1985, p. 25).

HHS's Secretary Heckler stated, "There's far more tolerance of incompetent males" and added that "women still have to struggle to be taken seriously" (Mayer, 1985, p. 25). Nancy Reynolds, a political consultant, "suggests that the lack of an 'old girl' network can leave such women dangerously isolated when trouble strikes" (Mayer, 1985, p. 25). Another White House woman said, "This is the most sexist place I've ever worked in my life. The women are incredibly overqualified for the kinds of jobs they're given" (Mayer, 1985, p. 25).

Organizational factors (hiring, employment practices, and so on), Kanter (1977), studying women in industry, reported that there were differences in existing opportunities for advancement available to women and men within the same organization. She concluded that a lack of opportunity to advance, not personality traits, separates the men from the women. Kanter pointed out that the tremendous effect of the organization's structure on what happens to those within the organization has been long overlooked. Behaviors and attitudes have been usually attributed to the traits of women rather than to the organizational environment. She stated, "The analysis needs a fuller view of the ways in which organizational structure impacts on individuals" (p. 259). "What happens to people in the course of their work is determined by the larger setting in which it takes place, and that setting, in contemporary society, is likely to be an organization" (p. 250).

Kanter proposed a structural approach or model for dealing with problems of sex discrimination and the place of women in the

organization. "Something has been holding women back. That something was usually assumed to be located in the differences between men and women as individuals" (p. 261). This is a standard explanation for discrimination and forms the basis for an "individual" model of work behavior. It adds up to "an assumption that the factors producing inequities at work are somehow carried inside the individual person" (p. 261). Affirmative action directives have produced pressures for change in organizations. Kanter contended, however, that these "efforts will not work any better than yesterday's, as long as individual models of behavior and change remain in full force" (p. 261). "Individual model thinking leads women to believe that the problem lies in their own psychology, and it gives the organizations a set of excuses for the slow pace of change" (p. 261). But, added Kanter, "responses to work are a function of basic structural issues, such as constraints imposed by roles and the effects of opportunity, power, and numbers" (p. 261).

Higher education institutions, being very traditional and conservative organizations, have been slow in accepting change. Only after considerable effort on the part of government did higher education become committed to affirmative action programs and the advancement of women (Kaplan & Helly, 1984).

Societal changes may be reflected in a recent study conducted by the American Council on Education, Office of Women in Higher Education (Watkins, 1985). A substantial increase in women heading colleges and universities was noted. The number of women presidents

grew by 93%, or from 148 to 286, between 1975 and 1984. Eight female presidential appointments in 1985 brings the total to 294. The largest percentage of women, however, head private institutions.

According to Alice F. Emerson, president of Wheaton College, current standards demand that women and minorities be included in the pool of applicants (Watkins, 1985). She added that "the only way more women will reach the top is by increasing their numbers in the pool from which top executives are chosen" (p. 33). Even though the numbers of women who are deans and above have increased, Emerson cautioned against complacency.

Helen Popovich, president of Florida Atlantic University, felt more needs to be done to get women started on academic careers (Watkins, 1985). She added,

I am concerned about our ability to get women into the first administrative level--department chairs. This is the most difficult position for women to achieve because department chairs are often elected. It is just not possible to insure that representative numbers of women will be selected or elected to the position. If you are not a department chair, it is very difficult to become a dean. (pp. 1, 33)

Astin (1977) suggested that several factors may be operating to limit the representation of women. Search committees for top academic administrative posts are traditionally dominated by older faculty men, "many of whom are unlikely to take any woman candidate seriously" (p. 65). Also, studies have suggested that there is a difference between the "status aspirations" of men and women. Another possible obstacle is "the criteria used for selection" (p. 65). Previous administrative experience is often given a great deal of weight, as well as top-level

administrative experience by search committees. Many women lack this experience and are thus not seriously considered. Possibly women may be bypassed for positions that usually lead to top posts such as deans and department chairpersons.

Sandler (1975) contended that institutions have generally relied on the "old boy" method of recruiting and hiring:

the vast informal network of old school chums, colleagues, drinking buddies, etc.--a network to which women and minorities rarely have access. The merit system has always been a closed merit system, for large portions of the available qualified pool have been excluded. (p. 409)

The government is asking that a larger pool of qualified persons have access to this system.

Sandler (1975) described the "old boy" system as "systematic, de facto, institutionalized discrimination: the 'old boy' network of recruiting; the use of irrelevant criteria, such as marital and parental status; different standards for men and women, etc."

The old informality of academe is rife with discrimination. Merit is simply not enough. The "old boys" seek out young proteges who are then taught the informal ropes of the profession. The "old boys" introduce them to other scholars; they nominate their proteges for the best scholarships, and they seek jobs for them as well. . . . Women and minorities are often excluded from the protege system: no one tells them about the good jobs or puts in their name for prestigious openings.

Women and minorities are not "old boys"; they are simply outside of the informal "prestige" system. If you ask a white male to recommend persons for a particular job, he will most likely recommend other white males. If you then ask the same person if he also could recommend qualified women and minorities, he very often can. The point is that this person is not discriminating consciously, he simply omits--albeit inadvertently--women and minorities in his thinking about potential applicants.

Thus, much of the discrimination in academia is not intentional or deliberate. Recruiting new employees through an informal network largely of white males is only one example of a practice or

administrative experience by search committees. Many women lack this experience and are thus not seriously considered. Possibly women may be bypassed for positions that usually lead to top posts such as deans and department chairpersons.

Sandler (1975) contended that institutions have generally relied on the "old boy" method of recruiting and hiring:

the vast informal network of old school chums, colleagues, drinking buddies, etc.--a network to which women and minorities rarely have access. The merit system has always been a closed merit system, for large portions of the available qualified pool have been excluded. (p. 409)

The government is asking that a larger pool of qualified persons have access to this system.

Sandler (1975) described the "old boy" system as "systematic, de facto, institutionalized discrimination: the 'old boy' network of recruiting; the use of irrelevant criteria, such as marital and parental status; different standards for men and women, etc."

The old informality of academe is rife with discrimination. Merit is simply not enough. The "old boys" seek out young proteges who are then taught the informal ropes of the profession. The "old boys" introduce them to other scholars; they nominate their proteges for the best scholarships, and they seek jobs for them as well. . . . Women and minorities are often excluded from the protege system: no one tells them about the good jobs or puts in their name for prestigious openings.

Women and minorities are not "old boys"; they are simply outside of the informal "prestige" system. If you ask a white male to recommend persons for a particular job, he will most likely recommend other white males. If you then ask the same person if he also could recommend qualified women and minorities, he very often can. The point is that this person is not discriminating consciously, he simply omits--albeit inadvertently--women and minorities in his thinking about potential applicants.

Thus, much of the discrimination in academia is not intentional or deliberate. Recruiting new employees through an informal network largely of white males is only one example of a practice or

policy which has a systematic and discriminatory impact on women, [a covert discrimination rather than an overt, blatant discrimination]. (pp. 409-10)

Moore (1984) concluded that "colleges and universities play a controlling, structuring role in the definition, duration, and outcome of administrative careers" (p. 14). She found that women are pocketed in one type of institution--the liberal arts college. In addition, women are pocketed in certain positions--at the bottom of the career ladder. Women primarily hold positions of registrars, librarians, and student affairs officers. Only 19% of the academic deans in her study were women. Finally, Moore found that

Women are pocketed in sectors of their colleges and universities that make them less likely to build administrative careers. Faculty have traditionally been the pool from which administrative talent has been drawn, but women faculty are still scarce, especially at senior levels. Women are plentiful in the clerical and technical areas, but colleges and universities have erected fairly impermeable barriers between these areas and the higher levels of administration. (pp.13-14)

The number of women holding senior-administrative positions has doubled in the past ten years. But despite these gains, the greater proportion of women administrators remain "stuck in the middle," according to Patricia Rueckel, Executive Director of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors (Chronicle of Higher Education, 1985b).

Bauer (1975) investigated the career progress of women administrators in continuing-education divisions in public four-year higher education institutions in Michigan. She examined their careers during the years 1960 through 1976. Bauer found that the majority of these women were given administrative positions that were not in a

direct promotional line within the division or within the institution. These may be dead-end positions from which advancement is highly improbable.

In business, Josefowitz (1980) attributed the hiring of more women now for entry-level positions to affirmative action. However, she contended they remain at the lower end of management.

Tokenism is the sharp issue at the top. One position might be opened at the top for a woman ("the woman's slot"), but once filled, all other available positions will be offered to male candidates only. "We already have a woman here" is an oft-heard statement. (p. 211)

Responses by participants in Bickel's (1980) study

reflected anger and frustration with situations which have and still exist within organizational systems. However, also reflected by comments was a sense of perseverance and hopefulness which is supported by the fact that many of these women aspire to top-level positions. Women indicated they were rising within the field but they do not feel this is always possible within their organizational systems. (p. 79)

In Patterson's (1974) study of women faculty in colleges and universities of Pennsylvania, almost one-third of the respondents cited the organization and administration as a major source of dissatisfaction in their careers. An area in which the response to "equality to status between male and female faculty" was overwhelmingly negative was that of the representation of women in administration. Respondents also indicated "with less pronouncement: that even though they were qualified, women were not promoted as quickly as men" and that "women do not aspire to administrative positions" (p. 87-88).

The prevalence of sexist attitudes and sex discrimination in higher education was the theme in almost 9 in 10 (88.4%) of the disadvantages cited by the respondents. Women stated that they had



received promotions more slowly than had men; that they performed the same work for less pay; and that men received preferential treatment in such areas as class scheduling, summer school contracts, and coaching assignments. They also felt that they had to work harder than their male colleagues in order to prove their competency; that they had been treated condescendingly; and that male superiority was assumed. (p. 70)

Walker's (1981) research focused on the investigation of the factors of career aspirations, professional socialization, and the culture of the organization as they affect the advancement of women in educational administration. She surveyed 128 male and female public school administrators. Her major hypothesis was that no significant difference exists in the managerial effectiveness of men and women administrators in public schools. Therefore, Walker suggested that the disparity in the number of women holding administrative positions in public schools may at least be due to different aspirations, the effects of mentoring ("the professional socialization networking process"), and sex bias existing in the culture of the organization.

Walker's data showed no significant difference in the managerial effectiveness of male and female administrators. She also found that the aspiration levels of men and women administrators were not significantly different. The data showed that both men and women administrators in the study had "professional socialization, networking systems" (mentoring) and did not differ significantly.

The culture of the organization was also suggested as an influencing factor in the promotion of women administrators. Perceptions of the administrators on employment practices within the school district were used as a measure of this. The data indicated

that the climate in which women administrators worked was perceived differently by women than by men. A significant number of women identified sex bias in employment practices of the school district. For example, in response to the statement "Men advance faster in administration with less experience simply because they are men," 59.4% of the females agreed (p. 115). Forty percent of the males responding disagreed. Approximately 66% of the female administrators agreed that "the 'old boys network' (white male club) promotes men over women for positions in administration" (p. 116). About 69% of the male administrators disagreed with this statement. Walker felt this finding may suggest "the existence of sex discrimination is a factor explaining the disparity in the number of male and female administrators" (p. 137). Males, in general, were not aware of these sex-bias practices.

Kuk (1981) examined the aspirations of women student affairs administrators as well as the organizational work climate in two- and four-year public and private higher education institutions. The results indicated that women aspire to higher-level positions. However, they perceived their organizational climate to be somewhat weak in support of professional development.

Capps (1976) found different aspiration levels between men and women supervisors in North Carolina public schools. Men exhibited higher aspirations for advancement than females in the study. Men aspired to administrative positions, while more than three-quarters of the women entered the profession with teaching as their goal. Capps

noted that women waited longer for promotions and were generally promoted to staff positions rather than line positions.

Women lacked comparable educational backgrounds to those of the men in the study. Male supervisors and assistant superintendents had more administrative experience than female supervisors. Women had more years of teaching experience and experience in supervision. Also, data showed that women were less mobile geographically than men--twice as many men were willing to move for job advancement than were women. Thus, Capps found little evidence of discrimination.

### Summary

Many of the studies reviewed were descriptive in nature, exploring women's perceptions or opinions. The majority of the research focused on public schools, colleges, and universities. A number of works dealt with women in management in business and industry. A few investigators included private colleges in their sample. No studies were found that limited the investigation of women administrators to small, independent (private) colleges.

The literature provided substantial documentation regarding the importance of role models to career development and success. Several authors indicated that the lack of role models in top-level positions or in particular fields can negatively influence women's career aspirations.

The majority of the literature reviewed supported the idea that mentoring and sponsoring relationships are desirable and valuable experiences for women. Only two authors (Fury, 1980; Phillips, 1977)

suggested that it is yet unproven that having a mentor is necessary for success. However, confusing the issue was a lack of agreement on the meaning and use of the terms "mentor" and "sponsor."

In the literature examined, the majority of the authors attributed barriers encountered by women to sex-role stereotyping instilled by early socialization (Bickel, 1980; Gappa & Uehling, 1979; Josefowitz, 1980; Schmuck, 1975; Unger & Denmark, 1975; Wolman & Frank, 1975). Experimental studies appeared to support the existence of sex-role stereotyping.

The literature provided conflicting findings concerning the factor of marriage and family as an internal barrier to career development and advancement. Josefowitz (1980) and Pally (1978) agreed that balancing career and family obligations is a much more critical problem for women than for men. Respondents in studies by Pally (1978), Davis (1978), Gasser (1975), Tyler (1979), Bickel (1980), Pacheco (1982), and Ott (1983) identified marriage and family responsibilities as constraints to women's career development, mobility, and productivity. Work by Kanter (1977) and a recent survey of women managers in business and industry (Hull, 1982) supported this. However, the data in studies by Giggelman (1979), Schlack (1974), Fisher (1978), Ferber and Loeb (1973), Freeman (1977), and Banfield (1976) indicated that marriage and parental obligations were not obstacles to women's careers. Other internal barriers mentioned in the literature concerned women's lack of confidence, aspiration level, and caretaking.

Women in administrative positions encounter societal and organizational barriers. There is a commonality in the literature regarding the kinds of external barriers perceived and/or experienced by women administrators and faculty. There appears to be little difference in the types of barriers cited by women working in educational organizations, business and industry, or in government. The complaints were similar. The major problem or most frequently cited obstacle was the exclusion from or lack of an "old boy" network (Banfield, 1976; Bickel, 1980; Davis, 1978; Dressler, 1981; Gasser, 1975; Ott, 1983; Pacheco, 1982; Pulliam, 1984; Sandler, 1975; Schlack, 1974; Stevenson, 1973; Stokes, 1981; Walker, 1981).

Other most frequently perceived constraints were less opportunity for participation in decision making than male counterparts (Davis, 1978; Harris, 1976; Hollon & Gemmill, 1976; Lenny, 1980; Pulliam, 1984; Schlack, 1974; Stevenson, 1973; Stokes, 1981); women administrators not taken seriously (Banfield, 1976; Mayer, 1985; Rogan, 1984; Schlack, 1974; Stevenson, 1973); discrimination in hiring, salaries, and promotion (Davis, 1978; Gasser, 1975; Piggott, 1979; Rogan, 1984; Sandler, 1975; Schlack, 1974); and women relegated to or pocketed in middle- or lower-level management positions (Banfield, 1976; Bauer, 1975; Chronicle of Higher Education, 1985b; Davis, 1978; Josefowitz, 1980; Mayer, 1983; Moore, 1984; Piggott, 1979). In only a few studies did the data indicate an absence of constraints or discrimination (Capps, 1976; Dressler, 1981; Woods, 1979).

## CHAPTER III

### DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The central purpose of this study was to identify the facilitators used, the positive factors perceived, and the barriers encountered and/or perceived by women administrators that may influence their career advancement. Additional investigation focused on their career aspirations and the support and opportunities provided by (or that exist in) the smaller educational institution.

Chapter I introduced the problem investigated in this study. Chapter II was a review of literature relevant to the research. In Chapter III the design of this investigation is presented. It includes an explanation of the population, the survey instrument, and the collection and analysis of data.

#### Type of Study

The descriptive method of research, using the survey technique, was employed. Borg & Gall (1983) stated, "Descriptive studies are primarily concerned with finding out 'what is'" (p. 354). They added, "survey research utilizes a variety of instruments and methods to study relationships, effects of treatment, longitudinal changes, and comparisons between groups" (p. 405). Descriptive research, then, is both an

appropriate and an effective technique to determine those factors that may influence women administrators' upward mobility.

### Population

The population was selected from four-year coeducational undergraduate independent (private) liberal arts colleges in seven ("Big Ten") states: Michigan, Indiana, Ohio, Illinois, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Iowa. Names of these institutions were found in the Education Directory, Colleges and Universities 1983-84, the HEP 1985 Higher Education Directory, and the 1983 College Blue Book--  
Narrative Descriptions.

The classification system used by the AAUP in their Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession (AAUP, 1984) was used to help identify four-year, independent (private) undergraduate liberal arts colleges. However, that classification, Category IIB (General Baccalaureate Institutions), included both public and private colleges. To further identify the independent liberal arts colleges, each state affiliate of the National Association of Independent Colleges and Universities was contacted for a list and description of their member colleges. Since this still did not provide a precise classification of private liberal arts institutions, it was decided that the classification system published by the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education as revised in 1976 would be used to identify those independent (private) four-year liberal arts colleges.

Both Liberal Arts I and Liberal Arts II institutions were included in the study. This classification includes all institutions

listed in the Education Directory, Colleges and Universities, 1976-77 published by the U.S. National Center for Education Statistics. In general, private institutions with fewer than 1,500 students in 1976 were classified as liberal arts colleges. Additional criteria listed by the Carnegie Council included:

Liberal Arts Colleges I. These colleges scored 1030 or more on a selectivity index developed by Alexander W. Astin or they were included among the 200 leading baccalaureate-granting institutions in terms of numbers of their graduates receiving Ph.D.'s at 40 leading doctorate-granting institutions from 1920 to 1955. . . . The distinction between a liberal arts college and a comprehensive institution is not always clear-cut. Some of the institutions in this group have modest occupational programs but a strong liberal arts tradition.

Liberal Arts Colleges II. These institutions include all the liberal arts colleges that did not meet our criteria for inclusion in the first group of liberal arts colleges. Again, the distinction between "liberal arts" and "comprehensive" is not clear-cut for some of the larger colleges in this group and is necessarily partly a matter of judgment. (Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education, 1976, pp. xvi-xvii)

One hundred twelve institutions were included in this study. Women administrators employed in these liberal arts colleges in seven states were contacted by mail and asked to participate in the study. The participants were restricted to those administrators identified in the HEP 1985 Higher Education Directory and the Yearbook of Higher Education, 1984-85. The 1983-84 Directory of Michigan Institutions of Higher Education published by the Michigan State Board of Education was also used, as well as catalogues from some colleges.

All middle- and upper-level women administrators identified in these directories provided a total population of 390 women. The administrators included women holding the titles of (1) president;



(2) chancellor; (3) comptroller; (4) vice-president; (5) assistant/associate vice-president; (6) business manager; (7) dean (academic affairs/faculty); (8) dean/director of a college, division, or program; (9) dean/director of continuing education; (10) director of the library; (11) registrar; (12) administrative assistant to the president; (13) dean/director of institutional research; and (14) division/department head/chairperson. Because so few women hold administrative positions in higher education, it was necessary to include all women in these positions listed in the directories. Due to the nature of the investigation, women with some experience in administration were needed; thus the decision was made to select only those in middle- and upper-level positions. No members of a religious order were included in this study.

#### Development and Testing of the Survey Instrument

In this study, a survey was conducted using a structured, direct-mail questionnaire. Orlich (1978) summarized the advantages of such an instrument:

1. Many individuals may be contacted at the same time, usually through the mail.
2. A questionnaire is less expensive to administer than is using an interview technique.
3. Each selected respondent receives identical questions.
4. A written questionnaire provides a vehicle for expression without fear or embarrassment to the respondent.
5. Responses are easily tabulated (depending on design of instrument).

6. Respondents may answer at their own convenience.
7. There is no need to select or train interviewers.
8. Persons in remote or distant areas are reached.
9. Interviewer biases are avoided.
10. Uniform data are gathered which allow for long-range research implications. (p. 4)

Since there was no existing instrument that adequately served to collect the data pertinent to this study, one was designed by the investigator (see Appendix C). Content of the questionnaire was derived from a review of the literature and from information received from a number of women administrators. Section IIA in the questionnaire also used some questions similar to those included in the Gasser (1975) and Woods (1979) studies. Section IIB, concerning barriers, incorporated some of the questions used by Stokes (1981). The services of a research consultant in the Office of Research Consultation, College of Education, Michigan State University, were obtained to critique the first draft of the questionnaire. To achieve a valid instrument, the following steps were followed.

### Pretest

An initial pretest of the instrument was done in October 1984. At the 1984 Conference of the Midwest Association of College and University Physical Education, seven women who were currently serving or had served as administrators completed the questionnaire and added their comments, suggestions, and/or reactions. On the basis of these suggestions, some revisions were made. Consultations with a statistics

professor in the Counseling and Educational Psychology Department at Michigan State University and with a research consultant resulted in some additional changes.

### Pilot Study

Thirty-seven women administrators in private liberal arts colleges in Pennsylvania participated in a pilot study in early December 1984. The questionnaire, a letter of transmittal, a response/comment sheet, and a return envelope were mailed to women holding middle- and upper-level administrative positions. Confidentiality was guaranteed participants--no questionnaires were coded, and names appeared only on the mailing envelopes.

Borg & Gall (1983) stated that if "the subjects are taken from a well-defined professional group . . . as few as twenty cases will often be sufficient" (p. 426). Respondents' comments concerning changes or improvements in the questionnaire were read, as well as responses to each item. The responses were entered into the computer for a brief analysis of the pretest results. Borg and Gall stated that this

will give you a chance to determine whether the methods you have planned to use for summarizing and quantifying the data will work satisfactorily. Also, the pretest results may suggest additional questions to you. For example, if sharp disagreement is found in the responses to a particular item of the questionnaire, it may be desirable to construct additional items that will help you understand the reasons for this disagreement. (p. 426)

A test of internal consistency was done on Section IIB of the questionnaire, using Cronbach's alpha coefficient. The resulting reliability coefficient was  $r = .93$ .

The instrument and brief analysis were reviewed by the members of the investigator's doctoral guidance committee, as well as a research consultant in the Office of Research Consultation, College of Education, Michigan State University. The final revision was also reviewed by a consultant at the Computer Center at Michigan State University for computer coding, format, and tabulation of data before final printing.

### The Survey Questionnaire

The survey instrument contained four sections. Section IA was designed to elicit information regarding the use of facilitators (role models, protege systems, and mentoring relationships) (Items 1 through 17).

In Section IB, respondents were asked to indicate the primary positive factors influencing their careers (Items 18 through 28). A standard Likert scaling, assigning a scale value to each possible response, was used: 5 = Very Important, 4 = Important, 3 = Undecided, 2 = Slightly Important, and 1 = Not Important.

Section IIA contained items pertaining to personal and professional barriers (Items 29 through 39). A Likert scale of six choices was used for responses: 0 = Not Applicable, 5 = Very Important, 4 = Important, 3 = Undecided, 2 = Slightly Important, and 1 = Not Important.

Section IIB contained items pertaining to barriers encountered in the organization by women administrators (Items 40 through 58).

Questions in this section were based on the work of Stokes (1981), as well as information selected from related literature. This section incorporated a Likert-type scale: 5 = Almost Always, 4 = Frequently, 3 = About Half the Time, 2 = Infrequently, and 1 = Never. Two open-ended questions (Items 59 and 60) asked for an identification of the greatest barrier encountered and for recommendations for change. All scale values were omitted on the questionnaire to avoid influencing the respondents.

Section III addressed career aspirations and the climate/support/opportunities for advancement respondents perceived to exist in their organization. Finally, Section IV requested personal, educational, and professional information.

Before processing the data, four ranges (based on mean scores) were arbitrarily established to distinguish among the degrees of importance of the items in Sections IB, IIA, and IIB: 3.5 and higher = Very Important, 3.49-2.50 = Important, 2.49-1.50 = Moderately or Slightly Important, and below 1.49 = Not Important.

#### Collection of Data

On March 20, 1985, 390 questionnaires were mailed to the women administrators described earlier. A letter of transmittal explaining the study, requesting participation, and assuring complete anonymity and confidentiality; a return self-addressed, stamped envelope; and a mailing label accompanied the instrument. Confidentiality and anonymity were guaranteed participants--no questionnaires were coded, and names appeared only on the mailing envelopes. The mailing label

was to be filled out and returned by those wishing a copy of the results.

A follow-up card was sent to all administrators as a reminder a week later. A second follow-up letter, including a second copy of the questionnaire, was mailed to all administrators during the week of April 22-26, 1985. Orlich (1978) recommended a similar sequence to insure the greatest response rate. (See Appendices B and C for copies of the letter of transmittal, follow-up card and letter, and survey instrument used in the study.)

Two hundred eighty-two usable questionnaires were returned for a response rate of 72%. Seventeen questionnaires, though returned, were unusable--some women had moved; others were on sabbatical, retired, ill, or no longer in the position.

#### Treatment and Analysis of the Data

Processing was handled at the Computer Center at Michigan State University. When the questionnaires were returned, data were transferred from the questionnaires to a data-coding sheet. The data were entered on a disk and were then entered on the system on a permanent file at the Michigan State University Computer Laboratory, Data Entry Division. Data were keyed in first and then verified.

A research consultant from the Office of Research Consultation in Michigan State University's College of Education advised in the preparation of the programs for data analysis. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to analyze the data.

General descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, mean, and standard deviation) were used to describe each variable included in the study. The rank order statistic was used to arrange items according to their importance. To answer Research Question 4, the chi-square test of association was applied, with an alpha level of .05. The responses to the open-ended questions were reported verbatim.

A test of internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) was run on Sections IB, IIA, and IIB of the final questionnaire. The resulting reliability coefficient was  $r = .89$ . The coefficient indicates that the questionnaire can be considered a reliable instrument.

### Summary

Included in this chapter was a discussion of the procedures followed in this study--the selection of the institutions and the population of women administrators, the development and testing of the instrument, and data collection. The chapter concluded with an explanation of the statistical methods used in analyzing the data.

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

#### Introduction

The purpose of this study was to identify the facilitators used and positive factors and barriers perceived by women administrators in the small higher education organization that may influence their careers; to examine their career aspirations; and to determine the climate, support, and opportunities they perceive as existing in their institution. The data reported in this chapter are presented in seven sections: (1) demographic data, (2) facilitators used, (3) positive factors perceived to influence career advancement, (4) barriers to career development, (5) relationship between type of position and responses, (6) career aspirations, and (7) organizational support.

Responses were received from 282 administrators in independent liberal arts colleges in Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Wisconsin, and Minnesota. Those responding to the survey broadly represented the traditional administrative positions found in higher education institutions. Some respondents did not answer every item on the questionnaire. Therefore, the total number of responses to each item may vary, and thus the numbers indicated in the respective tables may be different.



### Demographic Data

The population of this study comprised 282 women in middle- and upper-level administrative positions in liberal arts colleges. Tables 1 through 10 present a summary of the demographic data on the administrators.

#### Age of Respondents

Respondents were asked to classify themselves by age. The age distribution of those who participated in this study is shown in Table 1.

Table 1.--Age of respondents.

Age	Code	Number	Percent
25 & under	1	1	.4
26-29	2	11	3.9
30-34	3	23	8.2
35-39	4	48	17.0
40-44	5	50	17.7
45-49	6	44	15.6
50-54	7	35	12.4
55+	8	70	24.8
Total		282	100.0

Mean = 5.684.

Approximately 70% of the women were 40 years and older. Respondents in this study were similar in age to those in Gasser's (1975) and Woods's (1979) studies. Eighty-two percent of upper-level administrators in Gasser's study were over age 40; 50.4% of lower-level

administrators were over age 40. Almost 70% of women administrators in Woods's study were 40 years and older. The largest group of women administrators in this study, almost one-fourth, were in the 55+ age bracket.

### Ethnic Background

Table 2 presents a summary of the ethnic background of the participants. Ninety-six percent of the participants were Caucasian; less than 2% were Hispanic; 2.1% were of other races. Two participants were black.

Table 2.--Ethnic background.

Ethnic Group	Number	Percent
Black	2	.7
Caucasian	268	96.1
Hispanic	4	1.4
Other <sup>a</sup>	5	1.8
Total	279	100.0

Note: Three individuals did not respond.

<sup>a</sup>Includes Jewish, American Indian, Asian, and Chinese.

### Highest Degree Presently Held

Table 3 shows that the doctorate had been achieved by 37.4% of the women. Thirty-nine percent of the participants held the master's degree, and 15.7% had earned the bachelor's degree.

Table 3.--Highest degree held.

Degree	Number	Percent
B. A./B. S.	44	15.7
M. A./M. S.	110	39.1
Ed. S.	2	.7
Ph. D.	105	37.4
Other <sup>a</sup>	20	7.1
Total	281	100.0

Note: One individual did not respond.

<sup>a</sup>Includes the M.S.W., M.Ed., Ed.D., C.P.A., Master of Music, and Master of Divinity degrees.

#### Field of Highest Degree

Table 4 presents the field in which the highest degree had been earned. The table shows that 24.1% of the administrators had received their highest degree in arts and letters, and almost 24% had earned their highest degree in education. This may reflect the importance of the liberal arts at these institutions. It may also indicate that these women had followed a traditional route into administration from faculty positions.

These findings are different from those of Gasser (1975) and Woods (1979). Almost 50% of the administrators employed in public and private institutions who participated in Gasser's study held their highest degree in education. Woods reported that 92.1% of the administrators in the two- and four-year Michigan public institutions surveyed had earned their highest degrees in education.

Table 4.--Field of highest degree.

Field	Number	Percent
Arts & letters	66	24.1
Business/management	13	4.7
Education	65	23.7
Health sciences	13	4.7
Natural sciences & mathematics	25	9.1
Social sciences	39	14.2
Other <sup>a</sup>	53	19.3
Total	274	100.0

Note: Eight individuals did not respond.

<sup>a</sup>Includes library science, human ecology, communication, educational administration, social work, home economics, nursing, health/physical education, recreation, journalism, law, and hospital dietetics.

#### Title of Present Position

The position titles of the respondents are shown in Table 5. At the time of this study, one woman was serving as president of a liberal arts college, ten women held the position of vice-president, and four women were employed as assistant or associate vice-president. In 1981, Stokes found no women serving as president and only two serving as vice-president in nine universities in the State University System of Florida. Woods (1979) found no woman president but found one woman serving as vice-president in four-year public institutions in Michigan. In Gasser's 1975 study, 24 participants held the position of vice-president and two served as president in public and private four-year colleges. Almost 11% of the respondents in this study held the

position of dean or higher. The majority of women surveyed (76.6%) held positions below that of dean.

Table 5.--Title of present position.

Title	Number	Percent
President	1	.4
Comptroller	1	.4
Vice-president	10	3.5
Assistant/associate vice-president	4	1.4
Business officer/manager	2	.7
Dean (academic affairs/faculty)	4	1.4
Dean of a college/program	8	2.8
Administrative assistant to president	8	2.8
Director of continuing education	6	2.1
Director of a department/program	21	7.4
Director of library/head librarian	31	11.0
Registrar	33	11.7
Academic division head	33	11.7
Department chairperson/head	84	29.8
Other <sup>a</sup>	36	12.8
Total	282	100.0

<sup>a</sup>Includes director/dean of students/student services, associate dean, assistant/associate academic dean, dean of women, institutional research, athletic director, director of teacher education, associate director, and director of arts and sciences center.

#### Years in Present Position

Approximately two-thirds of the women had been in their current position six or fewer years (Table 6). The mean (3.879) indicates that the average number of years women had held their present position was approximately four years. Almost 15% of the women had been in the same position for 15 or more years.

Table 6.--Number of years in present position.

Years	Code	Number	Percent
1 year	1	38	13.5
2 years	2	51	18.1
3 years	3	28	9.9
4- 6 years	4	64	22.7
7- 9 years	5	34	12.1
10-14 years	6	25	8.9
15+ years	7	42	14.9
Total		282	100.0

Mean = 3.879

Median = 3.875

Years in College Administration

The total years in college administration varied from less than one year (.4%) to more than 15 years (17.9%), as shown in Table 7. The largest percentage of women (23.9%) had served in administrative positions four to six years. A majority of the respondents (73.6%) had been administrators four or more years.

Present Salary Range

The salary ranges of respondents are presented in Table 8. One-fourth of the respondents earned less than \$20,000. Sixty-one percent of the women earned under \$30,000. The largest group of administrators (36%) earned between \$20,000 and \$25,000. Almost one-fourth of the women earned \$30,000 or more.

Table 7.--Number of years in college administration.

Years	Code	Number	Percent
Less than one year	0	1	.4
1 year	1	12	4.3
2 years	2	30	10.7
3 years	3	31	11.1
4- 6 years	4	67	23.9
7- 9 years	5	45	16.1
10-14 years	6	44	15.7
15+ years	7	50	17.9
Total		280	100.0

Mean = 4.543              Median = 4.485

Note: Two individuals did not respond.

Table 8.--Present salary range.

Salary Range	Code	Number	Percent
Less than \$12,000	1	3	1.1
\$12,000-\$14,999	2	10	3.6
\$15,000-\$19,999	3	57	20.5
\$20,000-\$24,999	4	100	36.0
\$25,000-\$29,999	5	41	14.7
\$30,000-\$34,999	6	34	12.2
\$35,000 or more	7	33	11.9
Total		278	100.0

Mean = 4.439              Median = 4.190

Note: Four individuals did not respond.

Full-Time Student Enrollment

As shown in Table 9, 95.4% of the respondents were employed in a small college organization--that is, institutions with student enrollments under 2,000.

Table 9.--Full-time student enrollment.

Enrollment	Number	Percent
Under 1,000	147	52.3
1,000-1,999	121	43.1
2,000-3,999	10	3.6
4,000-4,999	1	.4
5,000+	2	.7
Total	281	100.0

Note: One individual did not respond.

Religious Affiliation of Institution

As reported in Table 10, 55.6% of the institutions maintained a Protestant affiliation, 26.2% were Roman Catholic, 16.5% had no religious affiliation, and 1.8% reported other religious affiliations.



Table 10.--Religious affiliation of institution.

Affiliation	Number	Percent
None	46	16.5
Protestant	155	55.6
Roman Catholic	73	26.2
Other	5	1.8
Total	279	100.0

Note: Three individuals did not respond.

#### Facilitators Used

Research Question 1: What percentage of women administrators in these independent four-year undergraduate coeducational liberal arts colleges have used facilitators (role models, protege systems, and mentoring relationships) during their careers?

The participants were asked to respond to 17 items in the first section of the questionnaire relating to facilitators influencing career aspirations and advancement. Responses are presented as frequencies, and open-ended statements are reported verbatim. The researcher has reported comments to open-ended items which were typical of all the comments made. The data are summarized in Tables 11 through 25.

#### Item 1

Respondents were asked to indicate whether a role model had been an influential factor in their career development and aspirations. Almost two-thirds (62.8%) answered "yes"; 37.2% said "no," as shown in Table 11.

Table 11.--Number of respondents influenced by a role model.

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	177	62.8
No	105	37.2
Total	282	100.0

Item 2

Table 12 presents the number of role models respondents indicated they had had. Of the 177 women who reported that a role model had influenced their career development and aspirations, 25.4% reported having one role model, 36.7% had two role models, 17.5% had three role models, and 20.3% reported having had four or more role models.

Table 12.--Number of role models.

Role Models	Number	Percent
One	45	25.4
Two	65	36.7
Three	31	17.5
Four or more	36	20.3
Total	177	100.0

Item 3

Respondents were asked to identify the individual(s) who had served as role models. Some of the 177 women identified more than one individual. The responses are summarized in Table 13. College administrators and college instructors were cited as role models by the greatest number of women (49.4% and 51.1%, respectively). Friends or colleagues served as role models to 40.9% of the 177 women responding to this item. "Others" mentioned by respondents included counselors; a minister, priest, or religious leader; coaches; social workers; a neighbor; public figures; great individuals throughout history; and women reported in the literature.

Table 13.--Individuals identified as role models (N = 177).

Individual	Number	Percent
College administrator	87	49.4
College instructor	90	51.1
Elementary and/or high school administrator	9	5.1
Elementary and/or high school teacher	22	12.5
Friend and/or colleague	72	40.9
Relative	32	18.2
Others	21	11.9
Total <sup>a</sup>	333	189.1

Note: One individual did not respond.

<sup>a</sup>figures due to multiple responses.

Item 4

Table 14 presents the number of women who indicated whether or not their careers had been aided by a sponsor. The group was almost evenly divided: 49.3% said "yes" and 50.7% said "no."

Table 14.--Number of respondents whose careers were aided by a sponsor.

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	138	49.3
No	142	50.7
Total	280	100.0

Note: Two individuals did not respond.

Item 5

Of the 138 women who acknowledged having a sponsor, 70 of them (51.1%) indicated they had male sponsors, 30 (21.9%) indicated they had female sponsors, and 37 (27%) indicated they had both male and female sponsors. (See Table 15.)

Table 15.--Number of administrators who recognized a male sponsor and/or a female sponsor.

Gender of Sponsor	Number	Percent
Male	70	51.1
Female	30	21.9
Both	37	27.0
Total	137	100.0

Note: One individual did not respond.

Items 6 and 7

The participants were asked to indicate the most important thing their male and/or female sponsor had done for them. The responses are summarized in Table 16. The researcher combined comments that were typical of all the comments made by those responding to these two items.

Some respondents gave multiple responses to these two items. Providing recommendations or letters of recommendation was the most often cited influence exerted by both male and female sponsors (34.9% and 38.8%, respectively). This was followed by encouragement and support--cited by 21.7% of the respondents having a male sponsor and 20.9% of those having a female sponsor. Confidence in respondent's ability and potential was a most important influence cited by 13.2% of those having a male sponsor and by 9.0% of those having a female sponsor. Respondents (9.4%) indicated that male sponsors were able to hire, promote, and advance them. Only 4.5% of the respondents cited this as the most important thing their female sponsor had done.

Item 8

Respondents were asked to indicate the number of male mentors they had had or currently had. The data are shown in Table 17. Of the 263 women responding to the question, 61.2% (161 women) reported having one or more male mentors.

Table 16.--Most important influence exerted by male and female sponsors.

Type of Influence	Male Sponsor (106 responding) <sup>a</sup>		Female Sponsor (67 responding) <sup>a</sup>	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Recommended/nominated me for position/promotion/ advancement; wrote letters of recommendation	37	34.9	26	38.8
Encouraged me; provided support	23	21.7	14	20.9
Confidence in my abilities, talents; believed in me; recognized my potential; backed me	14	13.2	6	9.0
Hired/promoted/advanced me; offered position	10	9.4	3	4.5
Vouched for my professional qualifications/performance capabilities; accomplishments; made name/capabilities known to others; "brags" for me; strongly influenced advancement	8	7.5	8	11.9
Provided advice/help/assistance/guidance; gave direction, made suggestions--practical, career, academic, etc.	8	7.5	7	10.4
Opened doors, made opportunities/projects/introductions available; put me in touch with influential people, interviews	7	6.6	4	6.0
Delegated/made available important, increased responsibilities	6	5.7	--	--
Developed my self-confidence	4	3.8	1	1.5
Trained in field opportunities; prepared me by involving me in his/her work	3	2.8	1	1.5
Challenged me, set high standards; gave me opportunities/ responsibilities that forced me to sharpen my skills and talents	3	2.8	1	1.5

Table 16.--Continued.

Type of Influence	Male Sponsor (106 responding) <sup>a</sup>		Female Sponsor (67 responding) <sup>a</sup>	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Valued my ideas, style	2	1.9	2	3.0
Included me/my ideas in high-power groups/projects	1	.9	1	1.5
Listened	1	.9	1	1.5
Appointed me to committees, panels, professional organizations, positions; provided opportunities to be influential	1	.9	1	1.5
Guidance on "good old boy" attitudes	1	.9	1	1.5
Involved me in professional organizations outside my discipline	1	.9	--	--
Gave me visibility inside and outside organization	1	.9	--	--
Role model	--	--	2	3.0
Encouraged professional involvement	--	--	2	3.0
Friendship	--	--	1	1.5
Showed me how to be strong and still be a woman	--	--	1	1.5
Gave me strength, courage, knowledge, inspiration	--	--	1	1.5
Improved my image among faculty	--	--	1	1.5
Set teaching standards	--	--	1	1.5
Provided opportunities for personal growth	--	--	1	1.5
Total <sup>b</sup>	131	123.2	87	130.0

<sup>a</sup>Includes responses from those who named both a male and a female sponsor.

<sup>b</sup>Figures due to multiple responses.

Table 17.--Number of male mentors.

Male Mentors	Number	Percent
None	102	38.8
One	78	29.7
Two	44	16.7
Three	16	6.1
Four or more	23	8.7
Total	263	100.0

Note: Nineteen individuals did not respond.

#### Item 9

The participants were asked to identify the individual(s) they had had or currently had as male mentors. Some of the 161 women who recognized male mentors identified more than one individual. The responses are presented in Table 18. Three-fourths of the group identified a male colleague or friend within the college serving as their mentor, 40.4% identified a colleague or friend outside the college, and 17.4% identified a relative as their male mentor.



Table 18.--Individuals identified as male mentors (N = 161).

Individual	Number	Percent
Colleague/friend in the organization/ college	122	75.8
Colleague/friend outside the organization/ college	65	40.4
Relative	28	17.4
Total <sup>a</sup>	215	133.6

Note: Nineteen individuals did not respond.

<sup>a</sup>Figures due to multiple responses.

#### Item 10

Respondents were asked to state the most important thing their male mentor(s) had done for them. The responses to this open-ended item are shown in Table 19. One hundred forty-seven women responded to this item. Some cited more than one important influence. The most frequently mentioned influence was encouragement and support, cited by 35.4% of the respondents. The second most frequently cited influence exerted by male mentors was advice and counsel (21.8%). Of those identifying a male mentor, 10.2% indicated that the mentor had provided help, aid, assistance, and information. Other important things (or types of influences) that male mentors had done for their mentees are also shown in Table 19.

Table 19.--Most important influence exerted by my male mentor (N = 147).

Type of Influence	Number	Percent
Encouragement/support; understanding; praise; backed me, my ideas	52	35.4
Advice, counsel, suggestions, insight--on advancement, strategies for pursuing a career, handling situations, thorny problems	32	21.8
Help, aid, assistance--in obtaining grants, writing, letters, how to do things, future plans; learn in present position; guidance, help in first year of job, as new faculty, during doctoral studies. Provided information, knowledge; information source--inside information, technical information. Taught me the ropes; taught me administrative skills	15	10.2
Helped me develop, build self-confidence, respect	11	7.5
Listened	10	6.8
Confidence/belief in me, my expertise, abilities, potential; believes in me	8	5.4
Sounding board--for ideas, frustrations. Exchanged ideas. Discussion, talks--about new ideas, alternatives, implications	8	5.4
Political advice; institutional politics; advice on internal politics; political strategies, who has clout; insight into political maneuvering	8	5.4
Recommended me; recommended me for positions	4	2.7

Table 19.--Continued.

Type of Influence	Number	Percent
Made me feel equal to men; didn't treat me different from male colleagues; treated/accepted me as a professional equal	4	2.7
Provided opportunities; opportunities to expand abilities, for increased responsibility	3	2.0
Set a good example	2	1.4
Provided feedback; positive reinforcement	2	1.4
Sharing; sharing concerns	2	1.4
Evaluator of decisions	1	.7
Respected me, my ideas	1	.7
Included me on important committees	1	.7
Praised my abilities to important administrators	1	.7
Inspiration	1	.7
Promoted me	1	.7
Total <sup>a</sup>	167	113.7

<sup>a</sup>Figures due to multiple responses.

Item 11

Table 20 presents the number of female mentors respondents had had or currently had. Of the 246 women responding to this item, 132 (53.5%) reported having one or more female mentors.

Table 20.--Number of female mentors.

Female Mentors	Number	Percent
None	114	46.3
One	68	27.6
Two	34	13.8
Three	7	2.8
Four or more	23	9.3
Total	246	100.0

Note: Thirty-six individuals did not respond.

Item 12

The women administrators were asked to identify the individual(s) they had had or currently had as female mentors. Some of the 132 women who recognized female mentors identified more than one individual. The responses are shown in Table 21. Almost three-fourths of the group identified a female colleague or friend within the college as their mentor, 48.5% identified a colleague or friend outside the college, and 10.6% identified a relative as mentor.

Table 21.--Individuals identified as female mentors (N = 132).

Individual	Number	Percent
Colleague/friend in the organization/ college	97	73.5
Colleague/friend outside the organization/ college	64	48.5
Relative	14	10.6
Total <sup>a</sup>	175	132.6

Note: Thirty-six individuals did not respond.

<sup>a</sup>Figures due to multiple responses.

### Item 13

Table 22 presents a summary of the most important thing(s) respondents' female mentor(s) had done for them. One hundred twenty-seven women responded to this open-ended item. Some of the women offered multiple responses about their mentor's influence. The most frequently mentioned influence was that of encouragement and support, cited by 54.3% of the women. Women having male mentors also cited this influence most frequently (35.4%). The second most frequently cited influence exerted by female mentors was that of advice (18.1%). This was also the second most cited influence that male mentors were seen as exerting (21.8%). Of those identifying a female mentor, 11.0% indicated that the most important thing the mentor had done for them was to be a listener. Other important things (or types of influences)

Table 22.--Most important influence exerted by my female mentor (N = 127).

Type of Influence	Number	Percent
Encouragement/support, understanding, praise, interest in--me, my efforts; my decisions, work, research, teaching, career, Ph.D.; my strengths, abilities; backing of new ideas	69	54.3
Advice; advice on--career; career advancement; career moves; how internal structure of college works, guidance	23	18.1
Listened	14	11.0
Taught me--important/necessary skills; research techniques; what I need to know about my job; expected behavior in academe. Training--in the organization and profession; provided assertiveness skills in dealing with others. Taught me the ropes. Helped me set priorities and organize and manage effectively	8	6.3
Helped me believe in myself; gain, develop my confidence; helped me think of myself as important	7	5.5
Provided information; career and network information	7	5.5
Sharing; sharing problems, ideas, interests, goals, frustrations, plans, observations	6	4.7
Sounding board	5	3.9
Offered suggestions, ideas; assisted on formulation of ideas; clarification of ideas; person on whom to test ideas, plans	5	3.9
Political information; gave perspective on college politics; information on women in the organization, sexual politics; advice on in-house political situations, issues	4	3.1

Table 22.--Continued.

Type of Influence	Number	Percent
Practical help, pointers	3	2.4
Confidence in me, my abilities; believed in me	3	2.4
Talk, discuss--mutually important ideas; honest, objective; talked sense to me	3	2.4
Strategy help; recommended strategies; tested strategies	3	2.4
Set example; provided standards	2	1.6
Role model	2	1.6
Constructive criticism	2	1.6
Networking	2	1.6
Feedback; positive reinforcement	2	1.6
Helped me develop professionally	1	.8
Shoulder to cry on	1	.8
Showed me how to be strong and still be a woman	1	.8
Stabilizing force	1	.8
Provide opportunity for growth	1	.8
Inspiration for character development	1	.8
Intellectual stimulation	1	.8
Total <sup>a</sup>	177	139.5

<sup>a</sup>Figures due to multiple responses.

that female mentors had done for their mentees are also summarized in Table 22. A comparison of Tables 19 and 22 indicates that influences exerted by male and female mentors were quite similar.

#### Item 14

Respondents were asked if they had sponsored or were currently sponsoring a protege. The responses are tabulated in Table 23. Of those responding to this item, 123 (45.6%) answered "yes"; 147 (54.4%) said "no."

Table 23.--Number of respondents sponsoring a protege.

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	123	45.6
No	147	54.4
Total	270	100.0

Note: Twelve individuals did not respond.

#### Item 15

Of the 123 women who indicated they had sponsored or were currently sponsoring a protege, 5.7% said that their protege was male, 59.3% responded that their protege was female, and 35.0% sponsored both male and female proteges. (See Table 24.)



Table 24.--Sex of protege.

Sex	Number	Percent
Male	7	5.7
Female	73	59.3
Both	43	35.0
Total	123	100.0

Item 16

The women administrators were asked if they had served or were currently serving as a mentor to someone. The responses are presented in Table 25. Of those responding to this item, 159 women (62.4%) answered "yes"; 96 women (37.6%) said "no."

Table 25.--Number of respondents serving as mentor.

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	159	62.4
No	96	37.6
Total	255	100.0

Note: Twenty-seven individuals did not respond.

Item 17

Of the 159 women who indicated they had served or were currently serving as a mentor to someone, 5.7% indicated their mentee

was male, 50.3% said their mentee was female, and 44.0% had mentored or were mentoring both a male and a female. (See Table 26.)

Table 26.--Sex of mentee.

Sex	Number	Percent
Male	9	5.7
Female	80	50.3
Both	70	44.0
Total	159	100.0

Positive Factors Perceived to Influence  
Career Advancement

Research Question 2: What factors do these women administrators in liberal arts colleges identify as the most important positive influences on their careers?

Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which certain factors had been positive influences on their career advancement. Ten factors that had previously been identified in the literature as positive influences were included in the list. Participants had five response options: Very Important, Important, Undecided, Slightly Important, and Not Important. Response options were numerically coded as follows: Very Important = 5, Important = 4, Undecided = 3, Slightly Important = 2, and Not Important = 1. The respondents could specify other factors not on the list. The responses to questionnaire items 18 through 27 are presented as frequencies in Table 27.

Table 27.--Positive factors influencing career advancement.

Factor	Very Important (5)	Important (4)	Undecided (3)	Slightly Important (2)	Not Important (1)	N
18. Affirmative action/equal opportunity policies	6.2%	19.8%	11.7%	21.2%	41.0%	273
19. Appropriate academic credentials	53.5	34.8	1.1	7.8	2.8	282
20. Being in the right place at the right time/luck	40.1	36.2	8.2	11.1	3.9	279
21. Competence	69.8	29.1	1.1	--	--	281
22. Drive/determination/ persistence	54.4	35.2	5.3	3.9	1.1	281
23. Experience in admin- istration	15.1	40.5	12.2	17.2	15.1	279
24. Female networking	5.1	10.9	15.6	16.7	51.6	275
25. Political savvy	15.8	32.4	11.2	15.5	25.2	278
26. Sponsorship (being a protege)	9.8	24.9	14.3	22.3	28.3	265
27. Support and encouragement of a mentor	19.3	36.1	6.7	10.8	26.8	269

In the Very Important category, three factors had a 50% or higher response rate: "Competence" (69.8%), "Drive/determination/persistence" (54.5%), and "Appropriate academic credentials" (53.5%). In the Important category, the following factors had the highest response rate: "Experience in administration" (40.5%), "Being in the right place at the right time/luck" (36.2%), and "Support and encouragement of a mentor" (36.1%).

Forty-one percent of the respondents indicated that "Affirmative action" was Not an Important influence, and 51.6% rated "Female networking" as Not Important.

A mean and a standard deviation (S.D.) were obtained for each of the ten factors in this section, based on the numerical coding. The factors are presented in rank order from the highest mean score to the lowest in Table 28. Before processing the data, four ranges were arbitrarily established to distinguish among the degrees of importance of the factors. These ranges were as follows: 3.5 and higher = Very Important, 3.49-2.50 = Important, 2.49-1.50 = Moderately or Slightly Important, and below 1.49 = Not Important.

"Competence" was perceived to be the greatest positive influence on respondents' career advancement. With a mean of 4.69, it was categorized as Very Important. "Drive/determination/persistence" was ranked second with a mean of 4.38 and was also considered a Very Important positive factor. The standard deviations for these two factors (.487 and .841, respectively), signified that there was high

agreement among respondents about these items as very important career influences.

Table 28.--Rank order of mean scores of positive factors influencing career advancement.

Rank	Factor	Mean	S.D.
1	21. Competence	4.69	.487
2	22. Drive/determination/persistence	4.38	.841
3	19. Appropriate academic credentials	4.28	1.02
4	20. Being in the right place at the right time/luck	3.98	1.14
5	23. Experience in administration	3.23	1.32
6	27. Support and encouragement of a mentor	3.09	1.53
7	25. Political savvy	2.98	1.46
8	26. Sponsorship (being a protege)	2.65	1.38
9	18. Affirmative action/equal opportunity policies	2.29	1.34
10	24. Female networking	2.01	1.25

"Appropriate academic credentials" ranked third (mean = 4.28), and "Being in the right place at the right time/luck" ranked fourth with a mean of 3.98. Even though the means show that both items fell in the range of Very Important, the standard deviations (1.02 and 1.14,

respectively) indicated that there was no high agreement about these items as important factors.

Four items ("Experience," "Support of a mentor," "Political savvy," and "Sponsorship") were categorized as Important factors with mean scores ranging from 2.65 to 3.23. Again, the standard deviations (1.32, 1.53, 1.46, and 1.38, respectively) indicated that there was no high agreement among respondents concerning these items as important factors.

"Affirmative action" and "Female networking" were ranked last--ninth and tenth, respectively--and were considered Moderately Important factors. Woods (1979) found that the majority of women in two- and four-year colleges in Michigan indicated that affirmative action did not serve as a positive influence in their career development.

Nineteen respondents listed other factors that they felt had had a positive influence on their career advancement. Typical comments included:

Having a well-developed set of ideals/vision.

My own drive--ambition, not to stay the same whether it is place or career.

Acceptance by faculty.

Personal desire to achieve.

Long hours/hard work/willingness to share resources, ability to get along with colleagues.

Understanding superiors who realize that women are important.

Caring about students--having time for them while doing a good job teaching and administrating.

Support and encouragement of spouse.

Having a family that also values my career.

Female friends who are equals who listen/advise/provide the proverbial shoulder, etc.

Initiative, originality and "overtime" hours.

Perceptions of people and ability to work well with others.

Always had strong support and encouragement from administrators.

High self-esteem, sense of self-worth.

### Barriers to Career Development

Research Question 3: What factors do women administrators in independent liberal arts colleges identify as barriers to their career advancement and/or career aspirations?

In Section IIA of the questionnaire, participants were requested to identify the degree to which 11 factors had been barriers to their careers. The factors listed were abstracted from the literature pertaining to barriers influencing women's career advancement. Six response options were provided and were numerically coded as follows: Very Important = 5, Important = 4, Undecided = 3, Slightly Important = 2, Not Important = 1, and Not Applicable = 0. The responses to questionnaire items 29 through 39 are presented as frequencies in Table 29.

No item elicited a high response rate in the categories Very Important, Important, or Slightly Important. With the exception of Item 31--"Demand/responsibilities of both career and family"--the highest response rate (30% to 50%) for all items fell in the category Not Important.

Table 29.--Barriers to career development as perceived by women administrators.

Factor	Not Applicable (0)	Very Important (5)	Important (4)	Undecided (3)	Slightly Important (2)	Not Important (1)	N
29. Age--too young	24.2%	4.8%	9.2%	5.9%	7.0%	49.1%	273
30. Age--too old	27.9	5.4	8.9	6.4	3.6	47.9	280
31. Demands/responsibilities of both career and family	18.0	20.9	23.4	3.2	14.7	19.8	278
32. Demands/responsibilities of aging parents	27.8	6.6	11.0	1.8	11.7	41.0	273
33. Interrupted employment due to pregnancy	42.1	3.7	7.4	1.5	5.5	39.9	271
34. Terminated employment due to husband's career move	46.5	8.5	7.4	1.5	1.8	34.3	271
35. Unable to take advantage of a pro- motion that would require moving	34.1	9.8	11.6	4.0	4.7	35.9	276
36. Insufficient publications and/or research	17.5	13.5	15.6	6.5	16.4	30.5	275
37. Lack of effective female networking/ support from other women	11.9	13.0	13.7	9.4	11.6	40.4	277
38. Lack of sponsor/mentor relationships	17.8	10.9	13.0	6.9	9.1	42.4	276
39. Tenure/promotion quotas filled	35.7	5.8	5.1	5.1	3.6	44.8	277



A mean and a standard deviation (S.D.) were obtained for each of the 11 factors, based on the numerical coding. These factors are presented in rank order from the highest mean score to the lowest in Table 30. The same range that was established for questionnaire items 18 through 27 (positive factors) was used with barrier items 29 through 39.

Table 30.--Rank order of mean scores of barriers to career advancement as perceived by women administrators.

Rank	Factor	Mean	S.D.
1	31. Demands/responsibilities of both career and family	2.568	1.858
2	36. Insufficient publications and/or research	2.127	1.703
3	37. Lack of effective female networking/support from other women	2.116	1.640
4	38. Lack of sponsor/mentor relationships	1.877	1.642
5	35. Unable to take advantage of a promotion that would require moving	1.525	1.700
6	32. Demands/responsibilities of aging parents	1.469	1.517
7	29. Age--too young	1.410	1.404
8	30. Age--too old	1.368	1.451
9	39. Tenure/promotion quotas filled	1.162	1.398
10	34. Terminated employment due to husband's career move	1.144	1.598
11	33. Interrupted employment due to pregnancy	1.033	1.340

One item--"Demands/responsibilities of both career and family"--was considered to be an Important barrier with a mean score of 2.568. Four items--numbers 36, 37, 38, and 35--were categorized as Moderately or Slightly Important barriers to advancement with mean scores ranging from 1.525 to 2.127. The remaining six items--numbers 32, 29, 30, 39, 34, and 33--were considered Not Important barriers, with mean scores ranging from 1.033 to 1.469. The standard deviations for all items in this section indicated that there was no close agreement among respondents on the importance of these barriers.

Section IIB of the questionnaire consisted of 19 conditions representing barriers to women's career advancement and/or aspirations. These barriers were selected after reviewing the literature regarding the experiences of professional women and from comments made by women administrators. The respondent was requested to indicate the degree to which she had experienced each barrier. Five response options were provided and were numerically coded as follows: Almost Always = 5, Frequently = 4, About Half the Time = 3, Infrequently = 2, and Never = 1. The respondents' experiences are presented as frequencies in Table 31.

When responses for Almost Always and Frequently encountered/experienced were combined, 3 of the 19 barriers had a 40% or higher response rate. Thus, 42.5% had "been paid less than the male administrator of equal ability," 42.3% "had to be more experienced and/or highly qualified than their male counterpart in order to succeed,"

Table 31.--Barriers to career advancement as experienced by women administrators.

Barrier <sup>a</sup>	Almost Always (5)	Fre- quently (4)	About Half the Time (3)	Infre- quently (2)	Never (1)	N
40. Excluded from an informal networking system--"old boy" network	11.5%	19.4%	18.3%	39.6%	11.2%	278
41. Decisions made through this network which excludes me result in my being "filled in" later	8.6	15.4	13.2	41.4	21.4	280
42. Had to work much harder than male counterpart to succeed	21.0	18.9	14.6	21.4	24.2	281
43. Had to be more experienced and/or highly qualified than male counter- part to succeed	19.0	23.3	11.1	23.3	23.3	279
44. Been ignored or found it difficult to participate during meetings/ discussions	6.1	13.6	16.1	38.9	25.4	280
45. Been judged more on basis of appear- ance and dress than male adminis- trator	6.5	16.2	10.8	36.5	30.0	277
46. Been placed in nurturant role of mother	2.2	14.0	9.3	41.6	33.0	279
47. At meetings, my input has been discounted/ignored	1.4	7.1	10.4	48.2	32.9	280
48. Male colleagues and subordinates have treated me differently from male administrators	7.9	16.8	23.3	35.1	16.8	279

Table 31.--Continued.

Barrier <sup>a</sup>	Almost Always (5)	Fre- quently (4)	About Half the Time (3)	Infre- quently (2)	Never (1)	N
49. Regardless of position/title, had less power/clout/authority/influence than male counterpart	8.9	19.6	18.9	31.1	21.4	280
50. Difficult to receive recognition for accomplishments	5.8	11.9	17.3	39.7	25.3	277
51. My ideas, opinions, views not respected or considered as seriously as those of men	7.2	11.1	20.4	37.6	23.7	279
52. Often interrupted in group discussions	3.6	6.9	8.3	56.0	25.3	277
53. Not consulted as often as men on decisions, policy	9.6	16.4	18.9	36.1	18.9	280
54. As I have advanced, barriers to success have become greater	9.7	18.6	14.3	31.4	26.0	258
55. Difficulty being accepted as professional equal by male counterparts	6.1	13.6	19.4	33.3	27.6	279
56. Viewed as too emotional, passive or too tough, aggressive and thus not considered for promotion	5.6	7.5	13.1	33.3	40.4	267
57. Sexual harassment	1.4	2.5	2.9	32.5	60.7	280
58. Been paid less than male administrator	24.4	18.1	13.7	20.4	23.3	270

<sup>a</sup>Complete titles are given in Appendix D.

and 39.9% "had to work much harder than their male counterpart in order to succeed."

Respondents also reported that they Almost Always or Frequently had been "excluded from an informal networking system involving information exchange, social activities and conversations, and decision making ('old boy' network) (30.9%); that, "regardless of position or title," they "had less power/clout/authority and less influence than their male counterpart" (28.5%); that as they "have advanced in administration, the barriers to success have become greater, making it more difficult to advance further" (28.3%); and that they "have not been consulted as often as men on matters involving critical decisions or matters of policy" (26%).

In the Never encountered category, responses ranged from 11% to 61%. Two items had the highest response rate. Most rarely experienced were "Sexual harassment (sexual remarks, innuendos, touching, etc.) has been a problem for me" (60.7%) and "I feel that I have been viewed as too emotional and too passive to be a leader, or conversely too tough and aggressive when in power and thus not seriously considered for promotion even though men with those disqualifications have been selected" (40.4%).

Thirty-three percent of the respondents also reported that they Never experienced being "placed in the nurturant role of mother to whom males bring personal problems and seek comfort and support"; 32.9% Never felt that their "input has been discounted/ignored and treated more like an interruption than a serious contribution to the ongoing

discussion"; and 30% Never experienced being "judged more on the basis of appearance and dress than the male administrator.

A mean and a standard deviation (S.D.) were obtained for each of the 19 barriers based on the numerical coding. These barriers are presented in rank order from the highest mean score to the lowest in Table 32. The same scale of numbers established for items in the previous two sections of the questionnaire (IB and IIA) was used for Items 40 through 58.

Table 32.--Rank order of mean scores of barriers to career advancement as experienced by women administrators.

Rank	Barrier <sup>a</sup>	Mean	S.D.
1	58. Been paid less than male administrator	3.000	1.518
2	43. Had to be more experienced and/or highly qualified than male counterpart to succeed	2.914	1.469
3	42. Had to work much harder than male counterpart to succeed	2.911	1.487
4	40. Excluded from an informal networking system--"old boy" network	2.806	1.210
5	48. Male colleagues and subordinates have treated me differently than male administrators	2.638	1.176
6	49. Regardless of position/title, had less power/clout/authority/influence than male counterpart	2.636	1.263
7	53. Not consulted as often as men on decisions, policy	2.618	1.236

Table 32.--Continued.

Rank	Barrier <sup>a</sup>	Mean	S.D.
8	54. As I have advanced, barriers to success have become greater	2.547	1.314
9	41. Decisions made through this network which excludes me result in my being "filled in" later	2.482	1.227
10	51. My ideas, opinions, views not respected or considered as seriously as those of men	2.405	1.171
11	55. Difficulty being accepted as professional equal by male counterparts	2.373	1.195
12	44. Been ignored or found it difficult to participate during meetings/discussions	2.361	1.174
13	50. Difficult to receive recognition for accomplishments	2.332	1.148
14	45. Been judged more on basis of appearance and dress than male administrator	2.329	1.241
15	46. Been placed in nurturant role of mother	2.108	1.081
16	52. Often interrupted in group discussions	2.076	.966
17	56. Viewed as too emotional, passive or too tough, aggressive and thus not considered for promotion	2.045	1.159
18	47. At meetings, my input has been discounted/ignored	1.961	.921
19	57. Sexual harassment	1.514	.794

<sup>a</sup>Complete titles are given in Appendix D.

No item in Section IIB of the questionnaire was considered Not Important (below 1.49) by the respondents. All 19 items in varying degrees of seriousness were confirmed as barriers to career advancement for women in higher education administration. No item fell into the Very Important category. Eight items were categorized as Important barriers to advancement with mean scores ranging from 2.547 to 3.000. The remaining 11 items fell into the Moderately or Slightly Important category, with mean scores ranging from 1.514 to 2.482.

Item 58--"As an administrator, I feel that I have been paid less than the male administrator of equal ability"--had the highest mean rating of 3.000, which indicates that this item was one of the more important barriers for the respondents. The standard deviation of 1.518 shows that there was a wide range in terms of the extent to which the respondents experienced this barrier.

Other items categorized as Important barriers included: Item 43--"I have felt that I had to be more experienced and/or highly qualified than my male counterpart in order to succeed" ( $M = 2.914$ ); Item 42--"I have felt that I had to work much harder than my male counterpart in order to succeed" ( $M = 2.911$ ); and Item 40--"I feel that I have been excluded from an informal networking system involving information exchange, social activities and conversations, and decision making ('old boy' network)" ( $M = 2.806$ ).

Respondents also reported that "male colleagues and subordinates treated them differently than they treated male administrators" (2.638), ranked fifth; that "regardless of position or title, they had



less power/clout/authority and less influence than their male counterpart" (2.636), ranked sixth; that they "have not been consulted as often as men on matters involving critical decisions or matters of policy" (2.618), ranked seventh; and that as they "have advanced, barriers to success have become greater" (2.547), ranked eighth. The standard deviations for these items again indicated a variation in terms of the extent to which respondents experienced the barrier.

Three items in the Moderately or Slightly Important category dealt with participation in discussions or meetings: Items 44, 52, and 47. The standard deviations for Items 52 and 47 indicated close agreement among respondents on these two items. It appears from the data that conditions concerning women's input, contributions, and participation in meetings or group discussions were not considered serious barriers by these respondents.

Item 57--"Sexual harassment"--fell in the Moderately/Slightly Important range and had the lowest mean (1.514). The standard deviation (.794) indicated high agreement among respondents on this barrier.

#### Item 59

Respondents were requested to identify the greatest barrier to the advancement of women in administration that they perceived at their institution. One hundred eighty-six women responded to this question. Some women gave multiple responses. Others indicated there were no barriers. Representative comments are presented here. (The complete list of comments appears in Appendix E.)

First, only lack of talent. Second, family/children especially and that isn't really a barrier, just a slowing down temporarily.

The good ole boy attitudes of the top administration that women should stay at home and the man supports them. Their perception of women in general--the attitude is indirectly brought into play at the least expected times.

Very little turnover of personnel. No place to advance to!

Women are too busy working--not political enough--women set low goals for themselves.

Lack of information. The administration is very secretive. Often decisions are made on obscure or hidden data. I do not know where I stand. The women who are my superiors support this system.

The "old guard's" feeling that women are inferior to men.

(1) A paternalistic attitude--"be good and you will be fine--we will like you." (2) Due to the institution's financial stress, pay scales are dreadful for all, but women take an even greater inequity.

The institution already is top heavy in upper-level administrators.

That the major administrative posts have always been held by men. The thinking is so entrenched--if/when there is an opening, even though gender is excluded from qualifications, the decision makers automatically think in terms of a man.

Prejudice combined with tight control by two or three males of basic information needed to plan or propose.

A personal attitude of inferiority.

The organization of the college. A group of about eight individuals make all decisions. The rest of us are very seldom even informed of the decisions.

I am the token female administrator. Women are too "flighty" to be given the "real" responsibility.

The perception that women should not be in authority positions--a Biblical interpretation.

Membership in the sponsoring churches' denomination and the reluctance of men to be led by women in that denomination. This might be all right.

The ole boy network is totally male here. The top six positions are all male, and the leadership style is male-characteristic. Women have no place.

Sufficient experience--higher education is not guilty of sex discrimination. Business, however, is much more so.

Female administrators are over-concentrated in support staff roles such as librarian, registrar and treasurer. These positions deserve more recognition and are undervalued.

All-male tradition. Inability to perceive women as being fully competent as leaders. Insensitivity to problems of women: personal, professional, curricular.

Sex is not a factor in departmental or divisional administration but seems to be in the central administration.

Male attitudes.

President and academic dean with no commitment to advancement of women or to holistic education or to minimal equity.

Traditional/conventional male-dominated institution.

Salary--feeling we're earning a second salary so don't need as much.

Women's attitudes about themselves--underconfidence, timidity--that have been engrained by conservative church background. I find that most male colleagues can adjust to a strong female colleague (given time) and will accept women colleagues. Dealing with those who act out stereotypes, they will respond in kind.

Other women who have been firmly entrenched in middle-lower administration who frequently behave unprofessionally and dislike the newer group of females.

The trustees and administration want to get rid of people at 55 and offer you little in early retirement--no one can advance after this time. They want to get a younger person and pay them much less than the low salaries we make.

Patriarchal philosophy of conservative church-related college.

The "good old boys" network.

Male stereotypes about certain jobs: finance, development, vice-presidents.

There are no women in the administration. The barrier is the current president.

I perceive none--it's amazingly open. That was not true 15 years ago!

Not enough positions; Catholic male dominance.

Aggressive, powerful men; financial problems which affect everyone equally.

Not being taken seriously because I am a woman--being considered too aggressive.

That women have to prove their abilities to advance, and possibly do more than others.

Lack of positions to move into (small school, small administration).

Anyone, male or female, who takes on substantial responsibilities for child care is going to be professionally disadvantaged.

Budgeting problems. Increasing the number of women probably is not possible when staff is being cut.

Bias against women on part of president.

Tradition!

Patronizing attitude of male administrators.

Lack of educational preparation and/or administrative experience.

A general mindset that men make administrators and women do not.

Expectation that women must be able to do a job better than a man in order to gain similar recognition/acceptance--marital status may be a factor where married women are given more opportunity than single.

Other women who hamper the image of professional women by constant negativism--whining and complaining.

Women in power who are not willing to support other women and women colleagues who do not want or are undecided about what they want but are still unwilling to support women who do want to advance in administration.

The president seems to be uncomfortable with women in power.

Inability to face idea that the institution practices de facto discrimination, although giving verbal assent to equality of treatment, attitude, etc.

President cannot work with women.

So few positions into which one can advance; small private college.

Not being a member of the religious order that founded and still runs the college.

Not academically qualified.

In a church-related institution, men are viewed as the primary leaders.

Sexism in hiring and retention.

The greatest barrier is connected with women administrators at the top who do not think women subordinates equal to male subordinates.

#### Item 60

Respondents were asked for recommendations to eliminate the barriers that hinder women at their institution. One hundred fifty-seven women offered recommendations. The researcher has reported recommendations that were typical of all recommendations made. (The complete list of comments appears in Appendix F.)

Constantly develop ideas/philosophy by keeping up in professional and liberal arts reading, discussions, conventions, courses, etc., and develop spiritually.

Have the men do an awareness course--actually I'm not very optimistic!

Hiring more women at equal salaries.

Education of the president.

That women take course work dealing with administrative responsibilities.

Perseverance; constantly raising the consciousness of men; questioning openly decisions, policies and procedures.

Reclassification of positions in such a way that there is a clear path to advancement. Also, hiring more females for top positions.

Become less passive and let it be known that you are interested in administration.

Better, more open communication of information (financial, planning, policy).

More active involvement and assertiveness by women.

Regular information sessions; more delineation of roles.

Removing some top administrators.

Fire the college president (this is no joke).

Increase the number of women as faculty and as administrators so women have voting clout.

Change philosophical viewpoint of president of college.

Representation of women on the president's executive committee.

Persistence; making my presence known until they're so used to me they forget about my femaleness. Get more women into administrative office at higher levels.

To institute a mentoring system . . . to hire more females.

Faculty status for all female library staff who need to deal with teachers as academic peers.

Leave before you're stuck.

Union/faculty control of administrative hiring.

A different president. In a small institution, the chief executive's comfort in dealing with women is crucial.

Hire more women faculty and staff.

We're working on affirmative action--current officer is inadequate because of other positions.

More clear accountability in different positions--job review--this way we can be judged by our merits, not as "women."

We currently have a woman president, well received and respected by all. Her success will open doors for women.

Open lines of communication.

Recognition of competence is a strong factor here; therefore, continuation of a job well done is the best recommendation.

We need to work hard, be competent, be flexible, and learn the system. It also helps to think like a male.

Perhaps continuing to "play the game" of "backing off" as soon as men feel threatened.

Provision for part-time tenure track employment. In my own case, it has been enormously helpful.

Administrators and faculty should be kept aware of the need for a larger number of women in key positions.

Educate the men! I am treated as a daughter or a grand-daughter, but rarely a colleague.

Women's network of support.

I'd like to see a commitment to academic and career development and hope resources (dollars, ideas, mentors, sponsors, etc.) could be created and provided for such a program.

Accreditation agencies must examine more closely blatant forms of organizational politics which are so effectively hidden during times of review. Even those against whom prejudice is focused are reluctant to expose those who "pay the bills."

Active recruitment to increase the number of women in top-level administration. Encouraging women with potential to become educationally prepared.

Having the few who are administrative do a noticeably good job breaks down barriers.

Must behave, dress, and speak in a professional manner.

Seriously--leave.

Get more competent, powerful women on the board. Pressure from colleagues for change.

Hire more qualified women. Attitude-awareness seminar.

Develop climate where honesty is possible. I don't know how specifically, other than encouraging and trying to practice this.

Female networking.

Fill in for a male administrator on his leave of absence; apply for employment as openings occur in administration.

Attract more outstanding female faculty to tenure track positions (including incentives that aid accomplishment of their dual roles--e.g., child care, ample maternity leave policies, and schedules that do not eat into evening hours and weekends).

More women on the search committees and interviewing process.

Become more assertive, learn the language of power and how to play politics. It can be a dirty game--women need to know the rules.

#### Relationship Between Type of Position and Responses

Research Question 4: Is there a significant relationship between part-time administrators (division heads and departmental chairpersons) and full-time administrators with respect to their responses to each item in Section IB (Positive Factors Influencing Career Advancement) and Sections IIA and IIB (Barriers to Career Development) of the questionnaire?

To determine on which items within three sections of the questionnaire the two groups differed, the chi-square test of association was applied. The results of the test on items in Section IB are presented in Table 33. As this table shows, with Items 18, 19, 20, and 26, there was a statistically significant relationship between position held and respondents' perception of the importance of these items. In other words, being a part-time administrator (a division head or departmental chairperson) or a full-time administrator determined their perception on these significant items.



Table 33.--Relationship between position held and responses to items in Section IB.

Item	Chi-Square Value	df	Signif. of Chi-Square
18. Affirmative action/equal opportunity policies	11.197	4	.024*
19. Appropriate academic credentials	19.316	4	.0007*
20. Being in the right place at the right time/luck	10.390	4	.034*
21. Competence	2.171	2	.337
22. Drive/determination/persistence	4.587	4	.332
23. Experience in administration	7.169	4	.127
24. Female networking	6.309	4	.177
25. Political savvy	3.253	4	.516
26. Sponsorship (being a protege)	11.384	5	.044*
27. Support and encouragement of a mentor	3.915	5	.561

\*Significant at the .05 alpha level.

Table 34 shows the responses of the two groups to Items 18, 19, 20, and 26.

A greater percentage of part-time administrators rated Item 18 ("Affirmative action") as Very Important (11.6%) than did full-time administrators (2.5%). This item was also rated Not Important by 35% of the part-time administrators and by 45% of the full-time administrators.

Table 34.--Responses of full-time and part-time administrators to Items 18, 19, 20, and 26.

Item	Position		Not Import- tant	Slightly Import- tant	Unde- cided	Import- tant	Very Import- tant
18	Full time	N	73	36	18	30	4
		%	45.3	22.4	11.2	18.6	2.5
	Part time	N	39	22	14	24	13
		%	34.8	19.6	12.5	21.4	11.6
19	Full time	N	8	19	2	62	74
		%	4.8	11.5	1.2	37.6	44.8
	Part time	N	0	3	1	36	77
		%	0	2.6	.9	30.8	65.8
20	Full time	N	3	14	12	60	75
		%	1.8	8.5	7.3	36.6	45.7
	Part time	N	8	17	11	42	37
		%	7.0	14.8	9.6	36.5	32.2
26	Full time	N	40	27	26	42	20
		%	25.6	17.3	16.7	26.9	12.8
	Part time	N	35	32	12	24	6
		%	32.1	29.4	11.0	22.0	5.5

More part-time administrators (65.8%) rated Item 19 ("Appropriate academic credentials") as Very Important than did full-time administrators (44.8%). No part-time administrators rated this item as Not Important, and only 2.6% rated it Slightly Important.

A greater percentage of full-time administrators perceived Item 20 ("Being in the right place at the right time") as Very Important

(45.7%) and Important (36.6%) than did part-time administrators (32.2% and 36.5%, respectively).

More full-time administrators (12.8%) than part-time administrators (5.5%) rated Item 26 ("Sponsorship") as Very Important. About 27% of the full-time group rated this item as Important, compared to 22% of the part-time group of administrators.

Table 35 presents the results of the chi-square test on the items in Section IIA of the questionnaire. One item, number 36, showed a statistically significant relationship between position held (part-time or full-time administrator) and respondent's perception of the importance of this barrier.

Table 36 shows the responses of the two groups to Item 36. A greater percentage of part-time administrators perceived this barrier--"Insufficient publications and/or research"--as Very Important (19.8%) and Important (19.8%) than did full-time administrators (8.8% and 12.6%, respectively).

The results of the chi-square test on items in Section IIB of the questionnaire are presented in Table 37. Two items (numbers 49 and 58) showed a statistically significant relationship between position held and respondent's encounter or experience with these barriers. In other words, those in part-time administrative positions (division heads and departmental chairpersons) and those in full-time administrative positions differed on how frequently they experienced these barriers.

Table 35.--Relationship between position held and responses to barriers in Section IIA.

Item	Chi-Square Value	df	Signif. of Chi-Square
29. Age--too young	1.350	5	.929
30. Age--too old	7.434	5	.190
31. Demands/responsibilities of both career and family	6.770	5	.238
32. Demands/responsibilities of aging parents	10.340	5	.066
33. Interrupted employment due to pregnancy	2.878	5	.718
34. Terminated employment due to husband's career move	4.007	5	.548
35. Unable to take advantage of a promotion that would require moving	7.993	5	.156
36. Insufficient publications and/ or research	18.847	5	.002*
37. Lack of effective female net- working/support from other women	5.650	5	.341
38. Lack of sponsor/mentor rela- tionships	3.992	5	.550
39. Tenure/promotion quotas filled	5.984	5	.307

\*Significant at the .05 alpha level.

Table 36.--Responses of full-time and part-time administrators to Item 36.

Position		Not Appli- cable	Not Impor- tant	Slightly Impor- tant	Unde- cided	Impor- tant	Very Impor- tant
Full time	N	33	59	21	12	20	14
	%	20.8	37.1	13.2	7.5	12.6	8.8
Part time	N	15	25	24	6	23	23
	%	12.9	21.6	20.7	5.2	19.8	19.8

Table 37.--Relationship between position held and responses to barriers in Section IIB.

Barrier <sup>a</sup>	Chi-Square Value	df	Signif. of Chi-Square
40. Excluded from an informal net- working system--"old boy" network	3.121	4	.537
41. Decisions made through this network which excludes me result in my being "filled in" later	6.758	4	.149
42. Had to work much harder than male counterpart to succeed	6.370	4	.173
43. Had to be more experienced and/or highly qualified than male counterpart to succeed	7.327	4	.119
44. Been ignored or found it diffi- cult to participate during meetings/discussions	4.905	4	.297
45. Been judged more on basis of appear- ance and dress than male administrator	7.912	4	.094
46. Been placed in nurturant role of mother	3.886	4	.421

Table 37.--Continued.

Barrier <sup>a</sup>	Chi-Square Value	df	Signif. of Chi-Square
47. At meetings, my input has been discounted/ignored	6.037	4	.196
48. Male colleagues and subordinates have treated me differently from male administrators	4.406	4	.353
49. Regardless of position/title, had less power/clout/authority/influence than male counterpart	10.134	4	.038*
50. Difficult to receive recognition for accomplishments	2.742	4	.601
51. My ideas, opinions, views not respected or considered as seriously as those of men	2.659	4	.616
52. Often interrupted in group discussions	4.250	4	.373
53. Not consulted as often as men on decisions, policy	2.582	4	.629
54. As I have advanced, barriers to success have become greater	5.926	4	.204
55. Difficulty being accepted as professional equal by male counterparts	7.913	4	.094
56. Viewed as too emotional, passive or too tough, aggressive and thus not considered for promotion	2.501	4	.644
57. Sexual harassment	2.653	4	.617
58. Been paid less than male administrator	15.728	4	.003*

<sup>a</sup>Complete titles may be found in Appendix D.

\*Significant at the .05 level.

The responses of the two groups to Items 49 and 58 are shown in Table 38.

Table 38.--Responses of full-time and part-time administrators to Items 49 and 58.

Item	Position		Never	Infre- quently	About Half the Time	Fre- quently	Almost Always
49	Full time	N	27	60	28	35	13
		%	16.6	36.8	17.2	21.5	8.0
	Part time	N	33	27	25	20	12
		%	28.2	23.1	21.4	17.1	10.3
58	Full time	N	27	32	26	38	39
		%	16.7	19.8	16.0	23.5	24.1
	Part time	N	36	23	11	11	27
		%	33.3	21.3	10.2	10.2	25.0

Eight percent of the full-time administrators and 10.3% of the part-time administrators encountered Item 49 Almost Always. In the Frequently category, 21.5% of the full-time and 17.1% of the part-time group experienced this item. Seventeen percent of the full-time group and 21% of the part-time group experienced this item About Half the Time. More part-time administrators (28.2%) than full-time administrators (16.6%) Never experienced this item.

A greater percentage of full-time than part-time administrators experienced Item 58. Twenty-four percent of the full-time group and 25% of the part-time group encountered this item Almost Always. In the

Frequently category, 23.5% of the full-time group encountered this item, compared to 10.2% of the part-time group; and 16% of the full-time administrators compared to 10% of the part-time administrators experienced this item About Half the Time. About 17% of the full-time administrators Never experienced this item, whereas 33.3% of the part-time administrators Never experienced this barrier.

### Career Aspirations

Research Question 5: What percentage of women administrators in liberal arts colleges aspire to higher-level administrative positions? If so, what steps are they taking to prepare for that career goal? If not, what reasons are given for not aspiring to a higher position?

The participants were requested to respond to six items in Section III of the questionnaire pertaining to their career aspirations. Responses are presented as frequencies in Tables 39 through 44.

#### Item 61

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they had achieved their highest career goal. As shown in Table 39, 127 (46%) replied "yes," 147 (53.3%) said "no," and 2 (.7%) were "undecided."

#### Item 62

Table 40 presents the positions women identified as the career goal they had achieved. Of the 127 women who indicated they had achieved their highest career goal, 1 (.8%) had achieved a presidency, 5 (4.1%) had achieved a vice-presidency, 9 (7.3%) had reached the position of dean, 3 (2.4%) had become an associate or assistant dean, and 45 (36.6%) had reached the position of director.



Table 39.--Number of respondents who had achieved their highest career goal.

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	127	46.0
No	147	53.3
Undecided	2	.7
Total	276	100.0

Note: Six individuals did not respond.

Table 40.--Position of highest career goal achieved by women administrators.

Position	Number	Percent
President	1	.8
Vice-president	5	4.1
Dean	9	7.3
Associate/assistant dean	3	2.4
Director	45	36.6
Other	60	48.8
Total	123	100.0

Note: Four individuals did not respond.

Forty-nine percent specified other positions as their highest achieved goal. These included positions as division head/chair, registrar, director of academic programs, departmental chairperson, special assistant to president, full professor, administrative assistant, and business manager. For 85.4% of the women, the position they had

achieved and which represented their highest career goal was a position below the level of dean.

#### Item 63

Participants were asked if they wanted to advance to a higher position. The responses are shown in Table 41. Of the 147 women who indicated they had not yet achieved their highest career goal (Table 39), 63 (44.7%) indicated they still wanted to advance to a higher position. Twenty-three (16.3%) said "no," they did not want to advance further. Fifty-five (39%) were "undecided."

Table 41.--Number of respondents wanting to advance to a higher position.

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	63	44.7
No	23	16.3
Undecided/don't know	55	39.0
Total	141	100.0

Note: Six individuals did not respond.

#### Item 64

To ascertain why women administrators did not wish to advance to a higher position in higher education, respondents were asked to cite factors or reasons for that decision. The reasons are enumerated in Table 42.

Table 42.--Reasons given by respondents for not wanting to advance to a higher position.

Response	Number	Percent
Do not want added responsibilities and time commitment	5	21.7
Too close to retirement	5	21.7
Satisfied with/prefer present position	4	17.4
Too much hassle/politics in administration	4	17.4
Wish to eventually return to teaching or counseling	4	17.4
Too many home responsibilities	3	13.0
Scarcity of positions	2	8.7
Other	11	47.8
Total <sup>a</sup>	38	165.1

<sup>a</sup>Figures due to multiple responses.

Of the 23 women who said they had no higher career aspirations, 21.7% indicated that they did not want the added responsibilities and time commitment, and 21.7% said that they were too close to retirement. Others (17.4%) were satisfied with their present position, 17.4% felt there was too much hassle or politics in administration, and 17.4% indicated that they would like to eventually return to teaching or counseling.

Forty-seven percent of the women gave other reasons for not wanting to advance further. Reasons that were representative of all those offered are presented here.

May want to go into private practice.

Would have to further my education--not too cost effective at this time.

Other career opportunities are also attractive.

It would require returning to school for an advanced degree.

Financial considerations--may have to leave higher education.

Would not fit within the "old boy" network.

Possible shift to clergy role.

Have a nice balance between teaching and administration.

Leave the field.

Looking for career change of direction.

It's always given to men.

Keep blood pressure low.

Want to own a business.

May wish to move back into industry.

Not a question of position--I'd rather be at another institution where I could be supported intellectually and politically.

#### Item 65

Participants were asked to identify the highest administrative position to which they aspired. The responses are presented in Table 43. Of the 63 women who indicated that they still wanted to advance further (see Table 41), 15% aspired to the position of college president and 25% aspired to the position of vice-president. Almost two-thirds (73%) of these women aspired to positions of dean or higher. Twenty percent of the respondents specified other positions. These included

the positions of chaplain, full professor, division chair, director of a larger library, and director at a larger school or move to a corporate sector.

Table 43.--Highest administrative position to which respondents aspire.

Position	Number	Percent
College president	9	15.0
Vice-president	15	25.0
Dean	14	23.3
Assistant/associate dean	6	10.0
Director	4	6.7
Other	12	20.0
Total	60	100.0

Note: Three individuals did not respond.

#### Item 66

Table 44 presents the steps respondents indicated they were taking to prepare for their highest career goal. Some of the 63 respondents who indicated that they wished to advance further (Table 41) gave multiple responses. The primary strategy mentioned by 68.3% of the respondents was that of increased involvement in college projects and/or committee work. The second most cited strategy (56.7%) was attendance at management/administrative training workshops and/or seminars. Thirty-two percent indicated that they were working on an advanced degree, and 7% said they were participating in an internship.

Table 44.--Preparation for career goals as indicated by respondents.

Type of Preparation	Number	Percent
Increased involvement in institutional projects, committee work	41	68.3
Attend management/administrative training workshops/seminars	34	56.7
Working toward an advanced degree	19	31.7
Participate in/applying for an internship	4	6.7
Other	17	28.3
Total <sup>a</sup>	115	191.7

<sup>a</sup>Figures due to multiple responses.

Twenty-eight percent of the respondents mentioned other steps they were taking. These included:

Training in related administration.

Administrative experience in Washington, D.C.

Research and curricular planning.

Moving to another institution.

Making contacts and consulting outside the institution.

Writing--publishing--scholarly efforts.

Working on my own to learn about organizations or administration--reading journals, asking questions, trying to acquire less naivete.

Change jobs for broader experience.

Being visible--interacting cross-departmentally.

Read the Chronicle, other administrative materials; communicate with colleagues regarding career.

Learning the job above me.

Being the best.

Remaining at one institution for over five years.

Possibly experience in teaching.

### Organizational Support

Research Question 6: What percentage of women administrators in liberal arts colleges perceive their institution as supportive and that opportunities exist in their institution for women to move into higher-level administrative positions?

Three items in Section III of the questionnaire pertained to organizational support. Responses to these items are presented as frequencies in Tables 45 through 47. Respondents were given an opportunity to add further comments. The researcher has reported comments that are representative of all those made.

#### Item 67

Participants were asked if their college provided or encouraged women to attend administrative training workshops or seminars. The responses are shown in Table 45. Almost 60% of the respondents felt that their institutions provided and/or encouraged women administrators to attend management training workshops; 28.1% said "no," and 12.8% were "not sure."

Table 45.--College provision and encouragement to attend administrative workshops as perceived by women administrators.

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	162	59.1
No	77	28.1
Not sure	35	12.8
Total	274	100.0

Note: Eight individuals did not respond.

#### Item 68

The opportunities made available by colleges to learn administrative techniques as identified by the respondents are presented in Table 46. The 162 administrators who felt that their institution provided and/or encouraged women to attend training programs (see Table 45) responded to this question. Some respondents cited more than one type of opportunity as being available.

An overwhelming majority (95%) cited "off-campus conferences and/or workshops" as an opportunity to learn administrative techniques. "Flexible work schedule to attend classes" was cited by about 50% of the respondents, and "on-campus conferences and/or workshops" was mentioned by 46%. Only 15% indicated that their college had established a formal program for administrative development.



Table 46.--Opportunities made available to learn administrative techniques as identified by women administrators.

Opportunities	Number	Percent
Off-campus conferences/workshops	153	95.0
Flexible work schedule to attend classes	80	49.7
On-campus conferences/workshops	74	46.0
Released time to attend classes	50	31.1
Sabbatical	44	27.3
On-the-job training	40	24.8
Formal program established by college for administrative development	24	14.9
Other	9	5.6
Total <sup>a</sup>	474	294.4

<sup>a</sup>Figures due to multiple responses.

Six percent mentioned other opportunities provided by their colleges. These included the following:

Funds for continuing education.

Generous budget and allowance of time for me to pursue.

All these things are done to a degree.

Administrative leaves for all administrators.

Maintain a library of professional literature.

Am in an administrative internship at present.

Allowed to subscribe to professional magazines.

Rotating chairs to give all administrative opportunity.

Exchange internship for faculty who are interested in investigating administration as a possible career move.

Encouragement only.

Sufficient funding for useful programs.

May also attend college classes at reduced tuition.

#### Item 69

To ascertain if the climate, or environment, and the selection process in these selected liberal arts colleges was one of encouragement and support for women aspiring to advance in administrative positions, participants were asked for their perceptions concerning this issue. The responses are shown in Table 47. Fifty-eight percent of the respondents felt that the environment and selection process at their college was supportive of women wishing to advance in administration. Thirty-eight percent felt it was not. Four percent were not sure.

Table 47.--Perceptions of respondents concerning whether their college climate and selection process was supportive.

Response	Number	Percent
Yes	153	58.2
No	100	38.0
Not sure	10	3.8
Total	263	100.0

Note: Nineteen individuals did not respond.

Participants were given the opportunity to comment on the issue. Ninety-five participants responded. Representative comments are presented here. (The complete list of comments appears in Appendix G.)

Support is not yet strong, but it is there.

They talk out of one side of their mouths and act out of the other--no women in senior administrative positions.

If religious.

It isn't supportive for anyone, but the bias is overwhelmingly male.

Will promote a woman to a higher position, then create a higher administrative position and hire a man.

Women hold jobs such as "administrative assistant," looking good on affirmative action reports but no real power jobs. Women always get these glorified secretarial jobs but no higher positions.

For women who are nuns, yes. For non-nuns, no higher than department chair.

Up to/through the middle-management level at any rate.

I answer yes because I do not perceive a negative climate.

No overt encouragement noticed.

It is beginning.

There is no official position against it, but it seldom happens.

This would change with a change in president. The religious affiliation of this particular college has supported the equality of men and women for the past 350 years.

Department heads are chosen by the administration. Often capable women have been passed over and men chosen.

Males are viewed as "having the answers."

Not in the central administration.

But it's not discouraging either.

Was a woman's college until late 60's--women have always held administrative posts.

Our president is a woman--that helps!

Too many mixed signals--I can't be sure.

Too many "good old boys."

It's subtle. The committees are supposed to do the work--actually it's all done in "good old boy" groups.

Neither is it negative--more noncommittal.

Depends on which level of administration you're talking about--highest levels, no; lower levels, yes.

The current administration actively seeks female applicants (recruits them).

Not at the present time. It depends on who the top administrators are.

It's mixed--there are, as everywhere, men in key positions who have a hard time realizing that it's 1985, but the general climate is very favorable.

Recently a woman was appointed president. She has made a difference.

Theoretically yes, pragmatically no.

Better than it used to be.

It is yes and no--recently appointed a female vice-president for administrative affairs--but seem to apply double standards for men and women.

For the most part.

Yes for lower positions since searches are done.

There's much talk but no real support.

This is a very strong yes.

In a church-related institution, men are viewed as the primary leaders. A qualified "yes."

Women do advance, but I perceive it is due to their drive and initiative.

Too many male chauvinists.

If the woman is well qualified and within the constraints of the number of positions open.

I believe the new administration is positive.

Sometimes--the token woman.

Facts belie lip service.

### Summary

This chapter contained the data compiled from a survey of 282 women administrators in selected four-year undergraduate, independent liberal arts colleges in seven midwestern states. The findings as applied to six research questions were presented.

The population was described through demographic data. General descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviations, and rank order) were used to describe each variable in each of the four sections of the questionnaire. The relationship between two groups of administrators and their responses to items in Sections IB, IIA, and IIB of the questionnaire were analyzed through the chi-square test. Responses to open-ended questions in the form of comments made by the administrators were included to amplify and clarify particular issues.

A summary of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations for further research are presented in Chapter V.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter contains a review of the purpose of the study, a summary of the procedures employed to collect the data, a summary of the research findings and conclusions and discussion. The chapter concludes with recommendations for further research.

#### Summary

This study was conducted to identify the facilitators used and positive factors and barriers perceived by women administrators in the smaller higher education institution that may influence their career advancement; to examine their career aspirations; and to determine the climate, support, and opportunities they perceive to exist in their institutions.

The literature was reviewed in the following two major areas: (1) literature related to facilitators to women's careers in administration--role models, mentors, and sponsors; and (2) internal and external barriers influencing women's career development in administration.

Six research questions were considered in this study:

1. What percentage of women administrators in these independent four-year undergraduate coeducational liberal arts colleges have used facilitators (role models, protege systems, and mentoring relationships) during their careers?
2. What factors do these women administrators in liberal arts colleges identify as the most important positive influences on their careers?
3. What factors do women administrators in independent liberal arts colleges identify as barriers to their career advancement and/or career aspirations?
4. Is there a significant relationship between part-time administrators (division heads and departmental chairpersons) and full-time administrators with respect to their responses to each item in Section IB (Positive Factors Influencing Career Advancement) and Sections IIA and IIB (Barriers to Career Development) of the questionnaire?
5. What percentage of women administrators in liberal arts colleges aspire to higher-level administrative positions? If so, what steps are they taking to prepare for that career goal? If not, what reasons are given for not aspiring to a higher position?
6. What percentage of women administrators in liberal arts colleges perceive their institution as supportive and that opportunities exist in their institution for women to move into higher-level administrative positions?

The population of this study comprised 282 women in middle- and upper-level administrative positions in four-year, undergraduate, coeducational liberal arts colleges in Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Wisconsin, and Minnesota.

A researcher-designed survey instrument was used to collect the following types of information: Section IA--facilitators (role models, sponsors, and mentors) used; Section IB--positive factors influencing career advancement; Sections IIA and IIB--barriers to career development; Section III--career aspirations and organizational climate; and Section IV--demographic data. In addition, the

questionnaire solicited remarks and comments from participants. The reliability coefficient ( $r = .89$ ) indicated that the questionnaire as designed could be considered a reliable instrument.

The data analysis included frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviations, and rank order statistics. The relationship between two groups and their responses to items in the questionnaire was analyzed using the chi-square test of association.

### Findings

#### Demographic Data

1. Almost 70% of the women were 40 years and older. The largest group of women in this study, 25%, were in the 55+ age bracket.

2. Ninety-six percent of the administrators were Caucasian.

3. The doctoral degree was held by 37.4% of the women. Thirty-nine percent of the administrators held the master's degree, and 15.7% held the baccalaureate degree.

4. The greatest percentage of women had received their highest degree in the fields of arts and letters (24.1%) and education (23.7%). Fourteen percent had earned their degree in the social sciences, 9% in natural science and mathematics, 5% in business, and 5% in the health sciences.

5. The majority of women (76.6%) held appointments below that of dean. Almost 5% were serving as vice-president or assistant/associate vice-president. One woman held the position of president.



6. Approximately two-thirds of the administrators had been in their current positions six years or less. About 15% had been in the same position 15 years or more.

7. Almost three-fourths (73.6%) of the respondents had had four or more years of experience as administrators.

8. Out of a range of less than \$12,000 to \$35,000+, the largest group of administrators (36%) earned between \$20,000 and \$25,000. One-fourth of the women earned less than \$20,000. Almost one-fourth (24.1%) earned \$30,000 or more.

9. Ninety-five percent of the administrators were employed in colleges with a student enrollment under 2,000.

10. Over half (55.6%) of the liberal arts institutions in this study had a Protestant affiliation. Twenty-six percent were affiliated with the Roman Catholic church, and 17% had no religious affiliation.

#### Facilitators Used (Role Models, Protege Systems, Mentoring Relationships)

1. The careers of almost two-thirds (62.8%) of the women had been influenced by one or more role models. Thirty-seven percent of the respondents reported having no role model(s).

2. Of those who reported a role model had influenced their career, 25% had had one role model, 37% reported having had two, 18% reported having had three, and 20% indicated they had had four or more role models.

3. Most frequently, women identified the following individuals as role models: college instructors (51%) and college administrators

(49%). Forty-one percent pointed out that their model had been a friend or colleague, 18% reported that the model had been a relative, and 13% identified the model as their elementary and/or high school teacher.

4. Forty-nine percent of the women had a sponsor who aided their career development. Fifty-one percent did not have the benefit of a sponsor.

5. Fifty-one percent of those having a sponsor had male sponsors, 22% had female sponsors, and 27% had both.

6. The most frequently cited important influences exerted by male and female sponsors were the following: providing recommendations (male sponsor--35%, female sponsor--39%), providing encouragement and support (male sponsor--22%, female sponsor--21%), and having confidence in the administrator's abilities and potential (male sponsor--13%, female sponsor--9%). More male sponsors (9%) were able to hire and promote than were female sponsors (5%).

7. Sixty-one percent of the administrators had the benefit of one or more male mentors; 39% did not.

8. Seventy-six percent of those having a male mentor identified a male colleague or friend within the college as their mentor. Forty percent identified a male colleague or friend outside the institution as their mentor, and 17% identified a relative as mentor.

9. The most frequently cited important things provided by male mentors were: encouragement and support (35%); advice and counsel (22%); and assistance, teaching, and information (10%).

10. Fifty-four percent of the administrators had one or more female mentors; 46% had none.

11. Of those acknowledging a female mentor, 74% identified as mentor a friend or colleague within the college, 49% identified a friend or colleague outside the college, and 11% identified a relative as mentor.

12. The most important things provided by female mentors as cited by respondents were: encouragement, support, and understanding (54%); advice and guidance (18%); willingness to be a listener (11%); and teaching and training (6%).

13. Forty-six percent of the women sponsored proteges; 54% did not sponsor.

14. Fifty-nine percent of those who served as sponsor indicated their protege was female, and 6% indicated their protege was male. Thirty-five percent sponsored both male and female proteges.

15. Sixty-three percent of the women had served as mentor to others; 38% had not.

16. Of those who had served (or were currently serving) as mentors, 50% indicated their mentee was female, 6% indicated their mentee was male, and 44% mentored both males and females.

### Positive Factors Perceived to Influence Career Advancement

1. "Competence" was categorized by mean score as a Very Important factor and was ranked first as the most important positive influence on career advancement.

2. "Drive/determination/persistence," "appropriate academic credentials," and "being in the right place at the right time/luck" were categorized as Very Important factors and were ranked second, third, and fourth, respectively, by mean scores as positive influences.

3. Four items, categorized as Important factors, were ranked fifth through eighth by mean scores: "experience in administration," "support and encouragement of a mentor," "political savvy," and "sponsorship (being a protege)."

4. "Affirmative action" was considered by respondents to be a Slightly Important factor (or influence) in career advancement.

5. Female networking, ranked last, was categorized as a Slightly Important career influence.

### Barriers to Career Development

1. Of 11 personal and professional barriers, one item-- "Demands/responsibilities of both career and family"--was considered to be an important barrier to career advancement. Four items were categorized by mean scores as Slightly Important barriers: "Insufficient publications and/or research," "Lack of effective female networking/support from other women," "Lack of sponsor/mentor relationships," and "Unable to take advantage of a promotion that would require

moving." Six barriers were considered Not Important: "Demands/responsibilities of aging parents," "Age--too young," "Age--too old," "Tenure/promotion quotas filled," "Terminated employment due to husband's career move," and "Interrupted employment due to pregnancy."

2. Women administrators confirmed the 19 items in Section IIB of the questionnaire as barriers to career advancement. The barriers ranked in seriousness from Important to Moderately Important by mean scores.

a. No barriers were rated in the Very Important range.

b. Eight items were ranked as Important barriers to advancement: Item 58--"Been paid less than male administrator"--was rated the most serious barrier; Item 43--"Had to be more experienced and/or highly qualified than male counterpart to succeed"--was the second most important obstacle; Item 42--"Had to work much harder than male counterpart to succeed"--was ranked the third most important barrier; Item 40--"Excluded from an informal networking system--'old boy' network"--was ranked fourth as an Important barrier; Item 48--"Male colleagues and subordinates have treated me differently from male administrators"--ranked fifth; Item 49--"Regardless of position/title, had less power/clout/authority/influence than male counterpart"--was ranked sixth; Item 53--"Not consulted as often as men on decisions, policy"--ranked seventh; and Item 54--"As I have advanced, barriers to success have become greater"--ranked eighth.

c. The remaining 11 items were ranked as Moderately or Slightly Important barriers and included such barriers as "My ideas, opinions, views not respected or considered as seriously as those of men"; "Difficulty being accepted as professional equal by male counterparts"; "Difficulty to receive recognition for accomplishments"; and "Often interrupted in group discussions."

d. Conditions involving women's input, contributions, and participation in meetings or group discussions were not considered serious barriers by respondents.

e. Item 57--"Sexual harassment"--ranked 19, was the barrier least encountered by respondents in this study.

#### Relationship Between Type of Position and Responses

Perceptions of positive factors and encounters with barriers were examined from the perspective of women holding two different positions--those who were part-time administrators (division heads and departmental chairpersons) and those who were full-time administrators. The chi-square test of association was applied with an alpha level of .05.

1. A statistically significant relationship was found between part-time and full-time administrators and their perception of the importance of four positive factors influencing career advancement: "Affirmative action/equal opportunity policies" (.024), "Appropriate academic credentials" (.0007), "Being in the right place at the right time/luck" (.034), and "Sponsorship (being a protege)" (.044).

2. A statistically significant relationship was found between position held (part-time administrator and full-time administrator) and respondents' perceptions of the importance of barrier 36--"Insufficient publications and/or research" (.002).

3. Two barriers--49--"Regardless of position/title, had less power/clout/authority/influence than male counterpart" (.038) and 58--"Been paid less than male administrator" (.003)--showed a statistically significant relationship between position held and the frequency of each group's encounter with these two barriers.

#### Career Aspirations

1. Forty-six percent of the women had achieved their highest career goal, and 53% had not.

2. Of those who had reached their highest career goal, the position achieved by 85% was below the level of dean.

3. Of those who had not yet achieved their highest career goal, 45% still aspired to a higher position, 16% did not, and 39% were undecided.

4. Reasons given for not wishing to advance to a higher position were: no desire for added responsibilities and time commitments (22%), too close to retirement (22%), satisfied with present position (17%), too much hassle in administration (17%), wish to return to teaching/counseling (17%), too many home responsibilities (13%), and scarcity of positions (9%).

5. Of those still wishing to advance further in administration, 73% aspired to positions of dean or higher. Fifteen percent

aspired to the position of college president, 25% aspired to a vice-presidency, and 23% aspired to be dean. Ten percent wished to become an assistant or associate dean, and 7% wanted to become a director.

6. The strategies being used by women to prepare for their career goal included: increased involvement in institutional projects, committee work (68%), attendance at administrative training workshops (57%), work toward an advanced degree (32%), and participation in an internship (7%).

#### Organizational Support

1. Fifty-nine percent of the respondents indicated that their college provided and/or encouraged women to attend administrative training workshops, 28% said "no," and 13% were "not sure."

2. Those who felt their college encouraged women to attend training workshops identified a number of opportunities made available to them to learn administrative techniques: off-campus conferences (cited by 95%), flexible work schedule to attend classes (50%), on-campus conferences (46%), released time to attend classes (31%), sabbatical (27%), on-the-job training (25%), and formal college program (15%).

3. Fifty-eight percent of the women perceived the climate and selection process at their college to be supportive of women aspiring to advance in administration. Thirty-eight percent felt it was not, and 4% were not sure.



### Conclusions

The results of the data analysis appear to point to the following conclusions:

1. Almost all (96%) of the women administrators in this study were Caucasian. Minority women are not well represented in middle- and upper-level administrative positions in these selected liberal arts colleges in that there were only two black women in this population.

2. Many women were serving in administrative positions without the terminal degree. The Ph.D. degree and the M.A./M.S. degree were held by about the same percentage of women administrators. The business/management degree has not yet been in evidence as an important degree for an administrator in a liberal arts college. The Ph.D. and M.A./M.S. degrees appear to be sufficient credentials for women in administration. It may not be necessary to have an earned doctorate in order to obtain a middle- or upper-level administrative positions in the liberal arts college. The data from Dressler's (1981) study showed that women have been serving in top-level administrative positions without the doctoral degree. She concluded that it is not necessary for a woman to have this degree in order to attain upper-level positions in higher education. It may be advisable to have the doctorate, however, to facilitate advancement. The present study showed that women perceived appropriate academic credentials to be important.

3. The greatest number of women earned their highest degree in the fields of arts and letters and in education. However, a number of other fields were represented as well. The data showed no clear

pattern in types of degrees/fields of study needed by administrators in liberal arts colleges. One would expect to find a predominance of degrees in arts and letters, but the data in this study showed many women with degrees in technical areas, as well, and not many in educational administration. This raises some interesting questions. What advice should be given to the woman going into administration in liberal arts colleges? Who makes the best administrator--the one with the academic degree or the one with a degree in educational administration? Would it be better to have an academic degree with an internship and management training?

4. The majority of women administrators in these liberal arts institutions did not hold the higher-level administrative positions. For the most part, they were concentrated in the middle or lower levels. The number of women administrators at the dean's level and higher was low. In the total population of 282 administrators, only 11% had achieved positions of dean or above. One woman was serving as college president. Apparently, it is difficult for women to obtain positions in upper-level management at these liberal arts colleges. The data confirmed the findings of an investigation by Sandler (1984). She indicated that even though there may be an increase of women in higher education administration, close to 90% of students attend institutions where men hold the top three posts of president, chief executive officer, and dean. Piggott (1979), Woods (1979), and Stokes (1981) also found few women in the top administrative positions.

5. The women in this study had had considerable administrative experience. Fifty percent of the respondents had had seven or more years' experience. It should be noted, however, that many of the respondents had been in their current position about the same number of years as they had been in administration. This could suggest that there is little or no career progress in administration at these colleges.

6. Role models had been influential in the career development and aspirations of almost two-thirds of the women administrators in these selected liberal arts colleges.

7. College administrators and college instructors were identified as role models by the greatest number of women acknowledging having a role model.

8. Both male and female sponsors played an influential role in the career development of approximately 50% of the women administrators. Feldman (1974) indicated that men may not be willing to sponsor a female protege. And Epstein (1970) felt that it might be difficult to establish sponsoring relationships between males and females. This apparently was not a problem for women in this study--51% identified a male as sponsor, and 27% had both male and female sponsors.

9. Male and female sponsors exerted similar types of influences. Primarily, they provided recommendations, encouragement and support, and confidence in their protege's abilities. However, more male than female sponsors were in a position to hire and promote.

10. Male and female mentors served as valuable resources for the majority of the women in this study.

11. Male and female colleagues and/or friends within the college served as mentors to approximately three-fourths of those respondents acknowledging having a mentor.

12. Both male and female mentors influenced the career development of women administrators in similar ways. Primarily, these mentors provided encouragement and support, advice and assistance, understanding and listening, and teaching and training. There is a historical tradition of mentoring, and mentoring is a process that is found in the development of female administrators. It is a well-developed process and one that apparently is accepted and is working for these women.

13. A greater percentage of women in this study served as mentors than as sponsors. Almost two-thirds (62.4%) had served or were currently serving as mentor to a male and/or female mentee. A little less than half the women in this study (46%) had sponsored or were currently sponsoring a male and/or female protegee.

14. The key factors facilitating career progress for women in this study were "Competence," "Drive/determination/persistence," and "Appropriate academic credentials." "Competence" was ranked as the most important factor aiding career advancement. Ninety-nine percent of the respondents rated "Competence" as an Important to Very Important positive career influence; 90% rated "Drive/determination/persistence"

as Important to Very Important; and 88% rated "Appropriate academic credentials" as Important to Very Important.

It should be noted that mentorship and sponsorship were ranked sixth and eighth, respectively, as positive career influences. As reported earlier, women in this study had been involved to quite an extent in supportive relationships. It was reported that 138 respondents indicated that they had a sponsor who aided their careers (Table 14), 161 women reported having one or more male mentors (Table 17), and 132 reported having one or more female mentors (Table 20). In addition, 123 women indicated they had served or were currently serving as a sponsor (Table 23), and 159 women had served or were currently serving as a mentor (Table 25). Although sponsorship and mentorship were categorized as Important factors, the ranking indicated that respondents valued, or rated higher, their own efforts and those individually acquired talents, abilities, and credentials above the aid or help of influential others. Women were using sponsors and mentors to help them. By becoming sponsors and mentors themselves, they were indicating that these are important resources; they are valuable in working toward that career goal. However, it is not the major resource. The major resource comes from themselves, not others. The data indicated that women felt the most critical factors in advancement were their own individual efforts and abilities.

These findings supported the work of other investigators. The factor of competence came out in Hennig's (1981) work. The women in her study claimed that a woman could advance through the ranks of

management "only if she were more competent at her current job, at the job above her and at the job below her than any man available" (p. 125). Women personnel administrators in Schlack's (1974) investigation were asked: "In your judgment, what do you consider to be the most influential factors for being in your current position?" (p. 91). The majority of the participants felt they had their positions because of their skill, qualifications, and abilities. In her study of career sponsorship, Mann (1980) reported that the most important factors in respondents' career advancement were being competent, having appropriate academic credentials, and being in the right place at the right time.

15. Affirmative action was not perceived as an important factor in career advancement. Colleges may have implemented affirmative action programs, but these programs are not seen as working in the real world. Other factors found in women's own abilities were seen as more effective. The fact that many of these women had been in administration and in their current position about the same number of years may indicate no opportunity for career progression in their institution. However, it may also indicate a lack of effectiveness of affirmative action policies.

16. Female networking was not considered an important factor in career advancement. For all the publicity female networking has received, one would expect a more positive response. However, networking was ranked last among positive factors influencing career advancement by the women in this study.

17. Barriers do exist for women in liberal arts colleges. Women indicated that these barriers exist in varying degrees of seriousness. The most serious barriers the women in this study faced involved pay inequity, having to be more experienced and highly qualified and having to work harder than their male counterpart to succeed, and being excluded from the "old boy" network. Women administrators were treated differently from male administrators, had less power and influence than their male counterpart, and were not consulted as often as men on matters of policy.

The data reported here supported some of the previous research in this area. As a result of their findings, Astin and Snyder (1982) concluded that there still is a discrepancy in salary between men and women in higher education. Women administrators in these selected liberal arts colleges reported that they were paid less than male administrators of equal ability.

Two-thirds of the respondents in Davis's (1978) study agreed that women "must be more accomplished and smarter than men to get the same positions." Forty-two percent of the liberal arts administrators in this study reported a similar experience (Item 43, Table 31).

Josefowitz (1980) pointed out that women have to work harder than men and must work harder to receive the same pay. A high percentage of administrators (87%) in Stokes's (1981) study reported that women "have to work twice as hard." Seventy-five percent of the women in Davis's (1978) research cited the same barrier. The findings of the present study indicated that this was also a concern for women

administrators in liberal arts colleges. Forty percent reported that they Almost Always or Frequently had to "work much harder than their male counterpart in order to succeed" (Item 42, Table 31).

A number of researchers (Bickel, 1980; Davis, 1978; Dressler, 1981; Lenny, 1980; Stokes, 1981) reported that women administrators cited the "old boy" network as a barrier. Almost one-third (31%) of the respondents in the present study had also experienced this barrier Almost Always or Frequently during their careers.

Sexual harassment was the barrier experienced by the fewest women administrators in these selected liberal arts colleges. Other researchers reported similar findings. The majority of women in Dressler's (1981) study indicated that they never experienced sexual harassment. Stokes (1981) reported that overt and covert sexual harassment was one of the rarely experienced barriers by women administrators in Florida.

With the exception of one item--"Demands/responsibilities of both career and family"--no personal or professional barriers were perceived as serious obstacles to career advancement. One would conclude after reading through the literature that such items as "Terminated employment due to husband's career move," "Interrupted employment due to pregnancy," and "Unable to take advantage of a promotion that would require moving" would be serious barriers if women are tied to husband, home, and family. However, according to the data, this was not a problem with these women. This finding may be unique to the present study because information on marital and family status was



not collected. The women in this study were older, which may also explain why these were not significant barriers.

18. Additional barriers to those listed on the questionnaire are present in liberal arts colleges and serve as obstacles to advancement. The greatest barriers respondents felt existed at their institutions were concerned with a lack of shared information, open communication; the patriarchal attitude of a conservative church-related college; no commitment to advancing women--minimal equity; lack of positions in a small school; and a lack of qualified women. Internal barriers such as women's attitudes about themselves--feelings of inferiority and lack of confidence--were listed. Other barriers concerned historical, traditional male attitudes--paternalistic, patronizing attitudes.

19. Respondents offered a number of recommendations to eliminate the barriers at their institutions. These included the following: Establish open lines of communication/information; positive, active recruitment of women for administration and faculty; part-time tenure track employment; pay equity; awareness and attitude-change training/consciousness raising; establish women's networking; and more clearly defined job descriptions, job review, and accountability so women are judged on their merits. Other recommendations made were: assertiveness and professional training, better representation of women on the president's executive committee; closer examination/evaluation of the college by accrediting agencies; and a commitment to career development and mentor/sponsor programs. Additional suggestions included: Get

powerful women on the board; have more women on search committees and involved in the interviewing process; get a president who recognizes the talents and abilities of women; and obtain the credentials.

20. Regardless of the type of position--full-time administrator or part-time administrator (department head and departmental chairperson)--a statistically significant relationship was found between these positions and perceptions of very few positive factors and barriers influencing career advancement. The positive factors were affirmative action, appropriate academic credentials, being in the right place at the right time, and sponsorship. The barriers were "Insufficient publications and/or research," "Regardless of position/title, had less power/clout/authority/influence than male counterpart," and "Been paid less than male administrator."

21. A little less than half (46%) of the women in this study had achieved their highest career goal. The positions reached by 85% of these women were below the level of dean. How can this low aspiration level be explained? Perhaps they were an older, more traditional group of women, for women have not been accepted in managerial roles for very long, nor have they been well represented in doctoral programs until recently. It may also reflect some disenchantment with administration (see Item 23).

22. Forty-five percent of the women who had not achieved their career goal still aspired to higher administrative positions. The majority (73%) of these women had career goals higher than most of those who had already achieved their desired position, aspiring to

positions or dean or higher. Forty percent aspired to positions of either college president or vice-president. The data supported the findings of Bickel (1980). Forty-three percent of the women in her study aspired to positions of president and vice-president. However, according to the findings of Woods (1979), the majority of administrators in her study, most of whom were program directors, did not wish to advance to a position higher than the one they presently had.

23. The primary reasons for not wanting further career advancement were: not wanting the responsibilities and time commitment, too close to retirement, satisfied with present position, too much hassle in administration, and may wish to return to teaching/counseling. Another reason a few women mentioned (which ties in with the importance of proper credentials) was the cost, time, and energy involved in having to further their education. Some of these reasons may reflect the age of the respondents. About 70% of the population was 40 years of age and older. More than one-third (37%) of the women were 50 years and older. They might also have been indicating that administration is not that desirable a career for everyone. As one woman put it, "I am really aggravated by the concept that bright, intelligent women ought to be upwardly mobile. I have found the upward track to be emotionally devastating. Life is too short! I'm trying to move downward and enjoy life again."

24. The primary strategies used by women in these liberal arts colleges to prepare for their career goal were increased involvement in college projects and committees, and attendance at administrative

training workshops. They may have been doing this for visibility. They may also have felt they needed the exposure to management techniques they could take back to their particular situation. Almost one-third were working toward an advanced degree. This statement is consistent with one of the perceived positive factors influencing career advancement--"Appropriate academic credentials"--ranked third in importance by respondents.

25. A majority (59%) of the participants felt that their college provided and/or encouraged women to attend administrative training workshops or seminars.

26. An overwhelming majority (95%) of the administrators cited off-campus workshops or seminars as the primary opportunity to learn administrative techniques. (This was also cited as one of the steps or strategies they were taking to reach their career goal.) It was not clear whether the women were participating because they thought it was a career facilitator or because the college was encouraging or providing this. Since this was cited as one of the major steps or strategies they were taking to reach their career goal, it is perhaps the former.

27. More than one-half (58%) of the women administrators in these selected liberal arts colleges perceived that the environment and selection process at their college was supportive of women aspiring to advance in administration. Yet more than one-third (38%) felt otherwise. Thirty-eight percent is a substantial number of women who felt there was a lack of organizational support. Written comments by the

respondents were mixed. A few said that support was beginning, coming; others indicated that there was little overt encouragement, that it was noncommittal. A number of women indicated that support was lacking at the higher levels of administration. Still others perceived a general lack of support.

#### Recommendations for Further Research

This study demonstrated that certain factors affect the advancement of women in administration in liberal arts colleges. A number of issues were raised that need to be studied in depth. The following recommendations are offered for further research.

1. Replicate this study on a national basis. The problems studied are not limited to these selected liberal arts colleges; a study nationally may determine the extent of agreement with the findings of this study.

2. A study is needed to explore in depth the career aspirations of women in liberal arts colleges.

3. Another interesting study would be a comparison of male and female administrators in liberal arts colleges to determine any differences in aspirations and in positive factors and barriers affecting their career advancement.

4. A study could be done of women in lower-level administrative positions to ascertain whether the findings are similar to those in the present study.

5. An in-depth study is needed on the effectiveness of affirmative action in liberal arts colleges--its effect on women's careers and aspirations.

6. Further research is needed to explore in depth the credentials and training critical to access to and advancement within administration in liberal arts colleges.

7. A study could be done to determine the career mobility of women administrators. What is the effect on the husband's career? To what extent are the spouses of these women administrators moving to accommodate their wives' career advancement?

8. This study showed that women in liberal arts colleges had used mentors and sponsors. An in-depth study of mentorship and sponsorship would be useful to determine the influence of these relationships on career aspirations and career progression.

9. An interesting study might be to assess any changes that can be made in the colleges that can effectively lead to equity for women working in these organizations. Perhaps an in-depth study of a program in place could be made to determine its effectiveness.

## APPENDICES

## **APPENDIX A**

### **COVER LETTER FOR PILOT TEST**





December 3, 1984

Dear Colleague:

I am a full-time faculty member at Aquinas College as well as a doctoral student in higher education administration at Michigan State University. As a past departmental chairperson, I have for many years been interested in the problems facing women in administration. I am in the process of gathering material for my doctoral dissertation concerning factors affecting the advancement of women in administration in liberal arts colleges. I believe the results of this study will provide data that may help women assess the aids and barriers influencing women's careers in higher education administration.

You are being invited to participate in a pre-test of the questionnaire. As an administrator in a private institution, you are the kind of person with the perceptions and experiences I need to explore those factors affecting women in administration. The purpose of this pre-test is to discover any potential problems with the questionnaire. Your responses to the items on the questionnaire and subsequent comments/reactions will help me make the necessary changes prior to the actual study.

Your assistance is essential to the success of this study. I realize that this is a very busy time of year for you. However, it should take only about 15 minutes of your time. All information will be kept in the strictest confidence. Please take those few minutes to complete the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed, stamped envelope by December 18, 1984.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Lenore Kalenda". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Lenore Kalenda

## **APPENDIX B**

### **LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL AND FOLLOW-UP CARD AND LETTER FOR SURVEY**

March 20, 1985



Dear Colleague:

I am a full-time faculty member at Aquinas College as well as a doctoral student in higher education administration at Michigan State University. As a past departmental chairperson, I have for many years been interested in the problems facing women in administration. I am in the process of gathering material for my doctoral dissertation concerning factors affecting the advancement of women in administration in liberal arts colleges. I believe the results of this study will provide data that may help women assess the aids and barriers influencing women's careers in higher education administration.

You are being invited to participate in this study. As an administrator in a private institution, you are the kind of person with the perceptions and experiences I need to explore those factors affecting women in administration. Since there are so few women in administrative positions in liberal arts colleges in the midwest, your participation is essential to the success of this study.

I assure you that all information will be kept in the strictest confidence and at no time will individuals be identified. The results of this study will be presented in aggregate form. Due to the limited number of women in certain administrative positions, the mention of a position and nature of the institution could possibly identify an individual. As the investigator, no such references in the analysis of data will be made if such a possibility of identification exists. Your completion of the enclosed questionnaire constitutes your consent to participate in this study.

I shall be glad to send you a summary of the results of this research. Just place your name and address on the enclosed mailing label and return it under separate cover.

I realize the heavy demands upon your time. However, it should take only about twenty minutes of your time. Please take those few minutes to complete the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed, stamped envelope by April 5, 1985.

May I, in advance, thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Lenore Kalenda".

Lenore Kalenda

Enclosures: Questionnaire  
Return Envelope

GRAND RAPIDS, MICHIGAN 49506 (616) 459-8281

Second mailing, follow-up postcard:

Dear Colleague:

A week ago you received a questionnaire concerning factors affecting the advancement of women in administration in liberal arts colleges. This is just a reminder to ask your help in completing and returning that questionnaire. If you have already done so, thank you. If not, your reply is needed in assessing the aids and barriers influencing women's administrative careers.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Lenore Kalenda



April 22, 1985

Dear Colleague:

Recently you were sent a questionnaire and a request to participate in a study to identify the aids and barriers affecting the advancement of women in administration in liberal arts colleges. If you have been among those who have returned the questionnaire, then this is another opportunity for me to say "thank you".

If you have been too busy to complete the form, may I ask that you do so now? It should take you no longer than twenty minutes. With so few women in administrative positions in higher education, your participation is critical to the success of this research. All information will be held in the strictest confidence. Another questionnaire is enclosed in case you have misplaced the first copy.

A return by May 3, 1985 will be greatly appreciated.

Thank you for your willingness to participate in this study.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Lenore Kalenda". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned below the typed name.

Lenore Kalenda

Enclosures: Questionnaire  
Return Envelope

**APPENDIX C**

**SURVEY INSTRUMENT**

## SECTION I.A.

1. Has a role model been an influential factor in your career development and/or aspirations?  
( ) Yes ( ) No
2. If yes, how many role models have you had?  
( ) One ( ) Two ( ) Three ( ) Four or more
3. If yes to question one, who has served as a role model? (Check as many as are appropriate).  
( ) College administrator ( ) Elementary and/or high school teacher  
( ) College instructor ( ) Friend and/or colleague  
( ) Elementary and/or high school administrator ( ) Relative  
( ) Other, please specify \_\_\_\_\_
4. Was your own career aided/influenced by a sponsor?  
( ) Yes ( ) No
5. If yes, was your sponsor  
( ) Male ( ) Female ( ) Had both male and female sponsors
6. What is the most important thing your male sponsor has done for you? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
7. What is the most important thing your female sponsor has done for you? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
8. How many male mentors have you had and/or currently have?  
( ) None ( ) One ( ) Two ( ) Three ( ) Four or more
9. Was/is your male mentor(s) (Check as many as apply)  
( ) A colleague/friend in the organization/college  
( ) A colleague/friend outside the organization/college  
( ) A relative

10. What is the most important thing your male mentor has done for you? \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
11. How many female mentors have you had and/or currently have?  
☐ None ☐ One ☐ Two ☐ Three ☐ Four or more
12. Was/is your female mentor(s) (Check as many as apply)  
☐ A colleague/friend in the organization/college  
☐ A colleague/friend outside the organization/college  
☐ A relative
13. What is the most important thing your female mentor has done for you? \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_
14. Have you sponsored or are currently sponsoring a protege?  
☐ Yes ☐ No
15. If yes, was/is your protege  
☐ Male ☐ Female ☐ Both
16. Have you served or are currently serving as a mentor to someone?  
☐ Yes ☐ No
17. If yes, was/is that individual  
☐ Male ☐ Female ☐ Both

## SECTION I. B.

Please indicate the extent to which you feel the following factors have been positive influences on your entire career advancement. Please check the most appropriate response for each item.

- |   | <u>Very</u><br><u>Important</u> | <u>Important</u> | <u>Undecided</u> | <u>Slightly</u><br><u>Important</u> | <u>Not</u><br><u>Important</u> |
|---|---------------------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 18. Affirmative action/equal opportunity policies.....( )   | ( )                             | ( )              | ( )              | ( )                                 | ( )                            |
| 19. Appropriate academic credentials.....( )                | ( )                             | ( )              | ( )              | ( )                                 | ( )                            |
| 20. Being in the right place at the right time/luck.....( ) | ( )                             | ( )              | ( )              | ( )                                 | ( )                            |
| 21. Competence.....( )                                      | ( )                             | ( )              | ( )              | ( )                                 | ( )                            |
| 22. Drive/determination/persistence.....( )                 | ( )                             | ( )              | ( )              | ( )                                 | ( )                            |
| 23. Experience in administration.....( )                    | ( )                             | ( )              | ( )              | ( )                                 | ( )                            |
| 24. Female networking.....( )                               | ( )                             | ( )              | ( )              | ( )                                 | ( )                            |
| 25. Political savvy.....( )                                 | ( )                             | ( )              | ( )              | ( )                                 | ( )                            |
| 26. Sponsorship (being a protege).....( )                   | ( )                             | ( )              | ( )              | ( )                                 | ( )                            |
| 27. Support and encouragement of a mentor.....( )           | ( )                             | ( )              | ( )              | ( )                                 | ( )                            |
| 28. Other, please specify: _____( )                         | ( )                             | ( )              | ( )              | ( )                                 | ( )                            |



## SECTION II. A.

The following concerns barriers to women's career development. To what extent have the following factors been significant/important barriers to your entire career? Please check the most appropriate response for each item.

## Personal Barriers:

- |   | Not<br>Applicable | Very<br>Important | Important | Undecided | Slightly<br>Important | Not<br>Important |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------------------|------------------|
| 29. Age - too young.....  | ( )               | ( )               | ( )       | ( )       | ( )                   | ( )              |
| 30. Age - too old.....  | ( )               | ( )               | ( )       | ( )       | ( )                   | ( )              |
| 31. Demands/responsibilities of both career and family..                      | ( )               | ( )               | ( )       | ( )       | ( )                   | ( )              |
| 32. Demands/responsibilities of aging parents.....                            | ( )               | ( )               | ( )       | ( )       | ( )                   | ( )              |
| 33. Interrupted employment due to pregnancy.....                              | ( )               | ( )               | ( )       | ( )       | ( )                   | ( )              |
| 34. Terminated employment due to husband's career move..                      | ( )               | ( )               | ( )       | ( )       | ( )                   | ( )              |
| 35. Unable to take advantage of a promotion that would<br>require moving..... | ( )               | ( )               | ( )       | ( )       | ( )                   | ( )              |

## Professional/Institutional Barriers:

- |  |     |     |     |     |     |     |
|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 36. Insufficient publications and/or research.....                       | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |
| 37. Lack of effective female networking/support from<br>other women..... | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |
| 38. Lack of sponsor/mentor relationships.....                            | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |
| 39. Tenure/promotion quotas filled.....                                  | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) | ( ) |

## SECTION II. B.

The following have been cited as barriers to further advancement and/or career aspirations for women in administration. To what degree do the following best describe your experiences during your career in a liberal arts institution?

Please check the one most appropriate response for each statement.

- |   | Almost<br>Always | Frequently | About 1/2<br>The Time | Infrequently | Never |
|---|------------------|------------|-----------------------|--------------|-------|
| 40. I feel that I have been excluded from an informal<br>networking system involving information exchange,<br>social activities and conversations, and decision<br>making ("old boy" network).....    | ( )              | ( )        | ( )                   | ( )          | ( )   |
| 41. Decisions made through this informal network<br>(locker room, luncheon, etc.) from which I have been<br>excluded, often affected my department and resulted<br>in my being "filled in" later..... | ( )              | ( )        | ( )                   | ( )          | ( )   |
| 42. I have felt that I had to work much harder than my<br>male counterpart in order to succeed.....   | ( )              | ( )        | ( )                   | ( )          | ( )   |
| 43. I have felt that I had to be more experienced and/or<br>highly qualified than my male counterpart in order<br>to succeed.....   | ( )              | ( )        | ( )                   | ( )          | ( )   |
| 44. I have sometimes been ignored or found it difficult<br>to participate during important meetings/discussions( )  | ( )              | ( )        | ( )                   | ( )          | ( )   |

- |  | <u>Almost<br/>Always</u> | <u>Frequently</u> | <u>About 1/2<br/>The Time</u> | <u>Infrequently</u> | <u>Never</u> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| 45. I feel that I have been judged more on the basis of appearance and dress than the male administrator....( )  | ( )                      | ( )               | ( )                           | ( )                 | ( )          |
| 46. I have been placed in the nurturant role of mother to whom males bring personal problems and seek comfort and support.....( )  | ( )                      | ( )               | ( )                           | ( )                 | ( )          |
| 47. At meetings my input has been discounted/ignored and treated more like an interruption than a serious contribution to the ongoing discussion.....( )   | ( )                      | ( )               | ( )                           | ( )                 | ( )          |
| 48. I feel that male colleagues and subordinates have treated me differently than they treated male administrators.....( )   | ( )                      | ( )               | ( )                           | ( )                 | ( )          |
| 49. Regardless of my position or title, I have felt that I had less power/clout authority and less influence than my male counterparts.....( )   | ( )                      | ( )               | ( )                           | ( )                 | ( )          |
| 50. I have found it difficult to receive recognition for my accomplishments.....( )  | ( )                      | ( )               | ( )                           | ( )                 | ( )          |
| 51. I feel that my ideas, opinions and views have not been respected or considered as seriously as those of men.....( )  | ( )                      | ( )               | ( )                           | ( )                 | ( )          |
| 52. I have often been interrupted in group discussions..( )  | ( )                      | ( )               | ( )                           | ( )                 | ( )          |
| 53. I feel that I have not been consulted as often as men on matters involving critical decisions or matters of policy.....( )   | ( )                      | ( )               | ( )                           | ( )                 | ( )          |
| 54. As I have advanced in administration, I feel the barriers to success have become greater, making it more difficult to advance further.....( )  | ( )                      | ( )               | ( )                           | ( )                 | ( )          |
| 55. I feel that I have had difficulty in being accepted as a professional equal by my male counterparts.....( )  | ( )                      | ( )               | ( )                           | ( )                 | ( )          |
| 56. I feel that I have been viewed as too emotional and too passive to be a leader, or conversely too tough and aggressive when in power and thus not seriously considered for promotion even though men with those disqualifications have been selected.....( ) | ( )                      | ( )               | ( )                           | ( )                 | ( )          |
| 57. Sexual harrassment (sexual remarks, innuendos, touching, etc.) has been a problem for me.....( )   | ( )                      | ( )               | ( )                           | ( )                 | ( )          |
| 58. As an administrator, I feel that I have been paid less than the male administrator of equal ability...( )  | ( )                      | ( )               | ( )                           | ( )                 | ( )          |
| 59. What is the greatest barrier to the advancement of women in administration that you perceive at your <u>present</u> institution? Include any not on this questionnaire.  |                          |                   |                               |                     |              |
-

60. What recommendation would you make to break down and eliminate the barriers which hinder women at your present institution?
- \_\_\_\_\_
- \_\_\_\_\_

## SECTION III.

Career aspirations and organizational climate/support. Please check the appropriate response(s).

61. Have you achieved your highest career goal?  
☐ Yes ☐ No
62. If yes, what position is/was it?  
☐ President ☐ Dean ☐ Director  
☐ Vice-President ☐ Assistant/Associate Dean ☐ Other, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

If you answered "yes" to question 61, skip items 63 through 66.

63. If you answered "no" to question 61, do you want to advance to a higher position in higher education?  
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Undecided/don't know
64. If no, why not? (Check all that apply.)  
☐ Do not want added responsibilities and time commitment. ☐ Too much hassle/politics in administration.  
☐ Satisfied with/prefer present position. ☐ Wish to eventually return to teaching or counseling.  
☐ Scarcity of positions. ☐ Too close to retirement. ☐ Other, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_  
☐ Too many home responsibilities.
65. If you answered "yes" to question 63, what is the highest administrative position to which you aspire?  
☐ College President ☐ Assistant/Associate Dean  
☐ Vice-President ☐ Director  
☐ Dean ☐ Other, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_
66. If you answered "yes" to question 63, what steps are you taking to prepare for that career goal? (Check as many as appropriate)  
☐ Attend management/administrative training workshops/seminars.  
☐ Increased involvement in institutional projects, committee work.  
☐ Participate in/applying for an internship.  
☐ Working toward an advanced degree.  
☐ Other, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_
67. Has your present college provided or encouraged women to attend any management/administrative training workshops or seminars?  
☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Not sure
68. If you answered "yes" to the previous question, check the appropriate opportunities to learn administrative techniques:  
☐ Flexible work schedule to attend classes. ☐ On-campus conferences/workshops.  
☐ Formal program established by college for administrative development. ☐ On-the-job training.  
☐ Off-campus conference/workshops. ☐ Released time to attend classes.  
☐ Sabbatical.  
☐ Other, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_

69. Do you perceive that the climate/environment and selection process at your present college is one of encouragement and support for women aspiring to advance in administrative positions? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

#### SECTION IV

**Background Data. Please check the most appropriate response.**

70. Present age. ☐ 25 or under ☐ 30-34 ☐ 40-44 ☐ 50-54  
☐ 26-29 ☐ 35-39 ☐ 45-49 ☐ 55+
71. Ethnic background.  
☐ Black ☐ Caucasian ☐ Hispanic ☐ Other, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_
72. Highest degree presently held:  
☐ BA/BS ☐ MA/MS ☐ Ed.S. ☐ Ph.D. ☐ Other, please specify: \_\_\_\_\_
73. Field/discipline of highest degree.  
☐ Arts & Letters (e.g., Languages, Literature, Philosophy).  
☐ Business/Management  
☐ Education  
☐ Health Sciences (Medicine, Nursing)  
☐ Natural Sciences & Mathematics  
☐ Social Sciences (e.g., Psychology, Sociology)  
☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
74. Title of present position.  
☐ President ☐ Dean of a College/Program  
☐ Comptroller ☐ Director of Continuing Education  
☐ Vice-President ☐ Director of a Department/Program  
☐ Assistant/Associate Vice-President ☐ Director of the Library/Head Librarian  
☐ Administrative Assistant to the President ☐ Registrar  
☐ Business Officer/Manager ☐ Academic Division Head  
☐ Dean (Academic Affairs/Faculty) ☐ Department Chairperson/Head  
☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
75. Years in present position.  
☐ 1 year or less ☐ 3 years ☐ 7-9 years ☐ 15 years or more  
☐ 2 years ☐ 4-6 years ☐ 10-14 years
76. Total number of years in college administration.  
☐ 1 year or less ☐ 3 years ☐ 7-9 years ☐ 15 years or more  
☐ 2 years ☐ 4-6 years ☐ 10-14 years
77. Present salary range.  
☐ less than \$12,000 ☐ \$15,000-\$19,000 ☐ \$25,000-\$29,000 ☐ \$35,000 or more  
☐ \$12,000-\$14,999 ☐ \$20,000-\$24,999 ☐ \$30,000-\$34,999
78. The full-time student enrollment in my school is:  
☐ under 1,000 ☐ 2,000-2,999 ☐ 4,000-4,999  
☐ 1,000-1,999 ☐ 3,000-3,999 ☐ 5,000 or over
79. Religious affiliation of my institution:  
☐ None ☐ Protestant ☐ Roman Catholic

Thank you for your participation! Please return this form to:

Ms. Lenore Kalenda  
 2919 Pioneer Club Road, S.E.  
 Grand Rapids, Michigan 49506

**APPENDIX D**

**COMPLETE TITLES OF NINETEEN BARRIERS IN  
SECTION IIB OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE**

Barriers Listed in Section IIB of the Questionnaire

40. I feel that I have been excluded from an informal networking system involving information exchange, social activities and conversations, and decision making ("old boy" network).
41. Decisions made through this informal network (locker room, luncheon, etc.) from which I have been excluded, often affected my department and resulted in my being "filled in" later.
42. I have felt that I had to work much harder than my male counterpart in order to succeed.
43. I have felt that I had to be more experienced and/or highly qualified than my male counterpart in order to succeed.
44. I have sometimes been ignored or found it difficult to participate during important meetings/discussions.
45. I feel that I have been judged more on the basis of appearance and dress than the male administrator.
46. I have been placed in the nurturant role of mother to whom males bring personal problems and seek comfort and support.
47. At meetings my input has been discounted/ignored and treated more like an interruption than a serious contribution to the ongoing discussion.
48. I feel that male colleagues and subordinates have treated me differently than they treated male administrators.
49. Regardless of my position or title, I have felt that I had less power/clout/authority and less influence than my male counterparts.
50. I have found it difficult to receive recognition for my accomplishments.
51. I feel that my ideas, opinions, and views have not been respected or considered as seriously as those of men.
52. I have often been interrupted in group discussions.
53. I feel that I have not been consulted as often as men on matters involving critical decisions or matters of policy.
54. As I have advanced in administration, I feel the barriers to success have become greater, making it more difficult to advance further.

55. I feel that I have had difficulty in being accepted as a professional equal by my male counterparts.
56. I feel that I have been viewed as too emotional and too passive to be a leader, or conversely too tough and aggressive when in power and thus not seriously considered for promotion even though men with those disqualifications have been selected.
57. Sexual harassment (sexual remarks, innuendos, touching, etc.) has been a problem for me.
58. As an administrator, I feel that I have been paid less than the male administrator of equal ability.

**APPENDIX E**

**WRITTEN COMMENTS BY WOMEN ADMINISTRATORS  
TO QUESTION 59 ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE**



Question: What is the greatest barrier to the advancement of women in administration that you perceive at your present institution? Include any not on this questionnaire.

Comments:

First, only lack of talent. Second, family/children especially and that isn't really a barrier--just a slowing down temporarily.

The good ole boy attitudes of the top administrators. Women should stay at home and the man supports them. Their perception of women in general--the attitude is indirectly brought into play at the least-expected times.

"Steady state"--not much hiring and few positions and tenure track slots are available--few new ones being created.

Primarily, women faculty; I think men may have more problems than women. Try advancement of religious over lay personnel for a study.

In wrong field for liberal arts, home economics.

Very little turnover of personnel. No place to advance to!

Very few women here.

Women are too busy working--not political enough. Women set low goals for themselves.

Opportunity to demonstrate competency.

Not being treated equally. Have made major strides in past two years--half of the senior administrators are women.

Lack of information--the administration is very secretive. Often decisions are made on obscure or hidden data. I do not know where I stand. The women who are my superiors support this system.

The "old guards" feeling that women are inferior to men.

Numbers of qualified women who want to live in isolated/rural town.

Socioeconomic area in which the institution is located is unattractive to single women and renders it unlikely that the spouse of a woman who moved here to take a job could also find professional employment. Poverty of the institution would make it difficult for a married female administrator to support her family. It just isn't a place which will attract many women at all.

The "old boy" network.

(1) A paternalistic attitude--"be good and you will be fine. We will like you." (2) Due to the institution's financial stress, pay scales are dreadful for all, but women take an even greater inequity.

Too few positions in the institution. Most positions are not hierarchical; therefore promotion, advancement is not a big factor except in area of faculty work.

The institution already is top-heavy in upper-level administrators.

As stated on the attached, other women have something to do with it. But also, men hold the power positions and women are not taken seriously or given the opportunity to perform.

Barrier is not being a nun. Female nun has few barriers. A physically disabled woman is not viewed as female--she is viewed as sexless (see sociological literature).

Inability to work for a female CEO.

Women not interested. (I'm not personally interested in being full-time administrator. I prefer teaching.)

That the major administrative posts have always been held by men. The thinking is so entrenched--if/when there is an opening, even though gender is excluded from qualifications, the decision-makers automatically think in terms of a man.

Prejudice combined with tight control by two or three males of basic information needed to plan or propose.

Very small college = few number of women in institution. So women are seen functioning in decision-making roles less often.

A personal attitude of inferiority.

The organization of the college. A group of about eight individuals make all decisions. The rest of us are very seldom even informed of the decisions.

So few of us.

I am the token female administrator. Women are too "flighty" to be given the "real" responsibility.

A new college president fired my sponsor and does not take female administrators seriously. In addition, the president is a poor judge of administrative ability of both men and women.

Antagonism of male faculty members to women in administration.

Female academic dean

Old-boyism--nothing overt.

No anticipated openings in the few available spots.

My sex and the perception that women should not be in authority positions--a Biblical interpretation.

The fact that they are women.

The answers are included in this questionnaire.

Membership in the sponsoring church's denomination and the reluctance of men to be led by women in that denomination. This might be all right.

The old boy network is totally male here. The top six positions are all male, and the leadership style is male-characteristic. Women have no place.

In my present position I have been given a central and influential opportunity to contribute. This is largely due to one person, the dean, that includes me in so many ways. He is a good person to work with and for.

That most women have simply not been here long enough to advance to the upper ranks (div. chairs).

Sufficient experience--higher education is not guilty of sex discrimination. Business, however, is much more so.

Female administrators are overconcentrated in support staff roles, such as librarian, registrar, treasurer. These positions deserve more recognition and are undervalued.

All-male tradition. Inability to perceive women as being fully competent as leaders. Insensitivity to problems of women: personal, professional, curricular.

Sex is not a factor in departmental or divisional administration but seems to be in the central administration.

They are not highly-enough qualified for the job.

None on the division level. However, president, dean, and all board members (except two) are male...and will continue to be!

None--At the moment all of our top administrators are women! President, academic dean, dean of students, administrative director, business manager.

Few problems; small college; I've been here the longest and full professor the longest.

Male attitudes.

President and academic dean with no commitment to advancement of women or to holistic education or to minimal equity.

Male attitudes.

Misogyny at the top. Furthermore, ours is a unionized campus. As department chair, I am not considered (thank God) a supervisor and, therefore, am not truly "in line" for administrative advancement.

It is in a very isolated geographic region, so women who are strongly oriented to career development in higher education are not attracted here in the first place.

Lack of competency in science or computers--the places where there have been the most openings.

Lack of qualified candidates.

Traditional--conventional male-dominated institution.

Females not eligible for presidency at present time.

Salary--Feeling we're earning a second salary so don't need as much.

No women administrators (except for two divisional chairpersons, of whom I am one).

Women's attitudes about themselves--underconfidence, timidity--that have been ingrained by conservative church background. I find that most male colleagues can adjust to a strong female colleague (given time) and will accept women colleagues. Dealing with women who act out stereotypes, they will respond in time.

There are currently some positions held by nuns that should be held by more effective personnel--men or women. Ineffective women give other women a bad reputation (men don't seem to have this problem).

Other women who have been firmly entrenched in middle-lower administration who frequently behave unprofessionally and dislike the newer group of females.

This is a women's college where currently the interim jobs and all major administrators are women. The new president will be a male and mainly in my opinion because it is felt he will be better able to deal with the "good old boys" where fund raising is concerned.

Conservative nature of the institution.

The trustees and administration want to get rid of people at 55 and offer you little in early retirement. No one can advance after this time. They want to get a younger personnel and pay them much less than the low salaries we make.

Upper administration's desire for representation by/for same men.

Patriarchal philosophy of conservative church-related college.

Now that we have two women as vice-presidents, I sense that the men feel they have fulfilled their "quota" of female administrators.

The "good old boys" network.

Male stereotypes about certain jobs: finance, development, vice-presidents.

Males in the position of hiring and they tend to hire males for the "real" administrative jobs and females for the less-responsible positions or traditional female-role positions.

Four out of top five positions are male.

Women uninterested.

There are no women in the administration. The barrier is the current president.

No major one.

One's own skill ability.

None really.

I perceived none--it's amazingly open. That was not true 15 years ago!

Not enough positions; Catholic male dominance.

None--our campus is becoming strongly feminist.

"Old Boys Club."

Aggressive, powerful men; financial problems which affect everyone equally.

No woman has ever advanced to level of vice-president, so the long-standing tradition of placing males in that position (or positions) must be acknowledged.

Not being taken seriously because I am a woman--being considered too aggressive.

Chauvinistic administrators.

That women have to prove their abilities to advance, and possibly do more than others.

Lack of positions to move into (small school, small administration).

Anyone, male or female, who takes on substantial responsibilities for child care is going to be professionally disadvantaged.

Few openings; few qualified women.

Budgeting problems. Increasing the number of women probably is not possible when staff is being cut.

I don't see barriers for women at my institution very often. Sometimes men have barriers here, too! For example, in the three-year history of faculty assembly, there have been no male officers.

I can't say that there are any significant barriers at my institution. The administration is making a real effort to hire and promote women. I have just been promoted to acting v.p. for administration. The barriers I presently feel are personal--e.g., being a single parent of a five year old.

No real barriers here.

Scarcity of upper-level positions.

Their (women's) own lack of assertiveness.

Few women qualified for higher positions.

Bias against women on part of president.

You can only go so high--the top goes only to one.

Tradition!

Don't think of women as potential top leaders.

Patronizing attitude of male administrators.

Our committee structure brings the senior faculty into key decision-making posts more than younger faculty--and more of our women are at the low-seniority spots in 1985.

Our organization is not well structured itself to advance anybody other than by the choice of the CEO, who would not have chosen a woman, I don't think. Also, we have no method of advancement (no "steps") and no way to obtain administrative experience within the organization, no sponsorship or mentoring--no commitment to development of women (or men either, really) in these roles. There has been a little advantage taken of the A.C.E.-N.I.T. with delegates sent a couple of times. No follow-up, though. We have a new C.E.O coming in, and it is hoped he will make many changes.

None at this time.

None.

My present institution is so tiny that I expect the barriers are there for both sexes. The biggest barrier is, however, that the community expects a man to be out hustling for contributions and attending to the presidential tasks (I think).

Since women must work harder and produce more than their male counterparts, professional ego threat is heightened. Defensiveness and territorial rights become more important than a sense of professional community.

None.

The hardest barrier for me was first starting out as an administrator and being the only female. I feared I would not gain their respect and confidence.

Not aware of existing barriers here.

Being a woman. Having that career with less status (e.g., librarian-ship). Husband's type of work, family's financial status, married status.

Historical perspective of "prejudice against women" in administrative/academic leadership positions.

Clinical practice is not viewed as experience by colleagues on rank and tenure; therefore, those years seem like wasted time in academia.

Lack of educational preparation and/or administrative experience.

The other administrators are all men, do not want women colleagues. The nursing division is all female. They value home/husbands more than work.

A general mindset that men make administrators and women do not.

No real barrier.

Ph.D. requirement when such credential is not essential to do the work.

We are a small institution and therefore have a limited number of administrative positions available. I believe the limited opportunity for advancement combined with vestigial attitudes regarding sex roles creates a barrier for women here.

Expectation that women must be able to do a job better than a man in order to gain similar recognition/acceptance--marital status may be a factor where married women are given more opportunity than single.

Other women who hamper the image of professional women by constant negativism, whining and complaining.

Women in power who are not willing to support other women and women colleagues who do not want/or are undecided about what they want--but are still unwilling to support women who do want to advance in administration.

The president seems to be uncomfortable with women in power.

None currently--but foresee strong dominant male leadership in new administration.

Male sexism.

Too small to have many administrative positions. Therefore, what few positions there are go to men, and there aren't enough positions so they can have a few token women administrators.



Lack of doctoral preparation.

Inability to face idea that the institution practices de facto discrimination, although giving verbal assent to equality of treatment, attitude, etc.

Recognition of the position more so than anything; being male or female does not make a difference in this area.

Perception of key people in institution that "there are too many women" in key roles.

A competent woman here will advance.

I don't think there are really any great barriers.

The size of both faculty and staff is decreasing, not increasing.

President cannot work with women.

I don't think there is any great barrier.

So few positions into which one can advance; small private college.

Not being a member of the religious order that founded and still runs the college.

Preconceived notions that top-level administrators (other than the nuns who operate the college) ought to be male.

In my case it depends more substantially on my intellectual stances as a feminist of color and my radical politics. It is clear to me that those women who tow the line are not respected more but get more rewards.

Do not perceive any barriers.

Availability of truly qualified women.

(1) Women themselves probably; (2) lack of institutional economic resources.

Lack of credentials (terminal degree) by most women managers--preventing them from advancing into vice-presidential post that requires a terminal degree. We are a small institution. There are not many layers through which one can advance.

Not academically qualified.

If not covered by across-the-board pay scale, there tends to be discrimination of women especially in administration.

Placed in beginning position that will not advance/be eligible for tenure and promotion.

All administrators (president, dean, assistant dean, treasurer, registrar, etc.) are males. All division chairmen are males.

In a church-related institution, men are viewed as the primary leaders.

The small proportion of tenured women from which to select and who wield significant influence.

Women have never held the top three administrative positions here; the rationale is lack of qualifications at this level.

I am at a women's college now, so there isn't this problem.

The men in administration.

Present male-dominated administration--few openings for women in the foreseeable future.

I see none.

Limited availability of qualified women with appropriate credentials.

The leadership crisis in society at large is reflected here.

Actually none--as you can tell, I am well satisfied.

Traditionally males have filled roles in the areas of deans, presidents, and provosts and those are the only positions left for me to move into at this college.

None except credentials.

Don't honestly see barriers related to sex.

The fact that they are not males.

I have not been at the institution long enough to answer many of these questions.

The attitudes of the present men at the highest administrative levels and probably also the board of trustees, who are almost all men.

Males have been here much longer.

None.

The ambitions of other women.

The greatest barrier is connected with women administrators at the top who do not think women subordinates equal to male subordinates.

Image of females and nursing.

Paternalistic attitude of chief administrative officer.

None.

Traditional attitudes.

They have never been there.

Informal and unofficial structure; preponderance of males in secured positions of importance; women don't stay long enough to move into those positions (people have either been here "forever" or they come and go within three to four years).

I would be guessing if I answered this.

Lack of sufficient funds to accomplish some of my goals for the institution.

No administrative help (clerical and technical).

Sexism in hiring and retention.

The religious order which operates the school tends to fill these positions with their members. This is a women's order at a women's college. The administration is atypically female.

Undecided. Relatively new in position.

The women are not qualified. They lack academic credentials--distinguished publication records, etc.

Lack of confidence in self.

All major administrative posts held by men. Not strong enough commitment among them to bring in women.

Little opportunity for advancement--college usually seeks outside candidates for the levels above me.

Other administrators and mainly one male.

## **APPENDIX F**

### **WRITTEN COMMENTS BY WOMEN ADMINISTRATORS TO QUESTION 60 ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE**

Question: What recommendation would you make to break down and eliminate the barriers which hinder women at your present institution?

Comments:

Constantly develop ideas/philosophy by keeping up in professional and liberal arts reading, discussions, conventions, courses, etc., and develop spiritually.

Change of attitudes or training for women when they are in power positions--it goes to their heads and they are worse than men. Positive reinforcement to men when they hire women--our expectations need to be realistic--it is not all men's fault.

Get new administrators.

If we want to advance, we have to go to another institution, which is difficult unless one wants to uproot husband and children.

Have the men do an awareness course--actually I'm not very optimistic!

Hiring more women at equal salaries.

There should be more women hired--correctly I would guess that we are three-fourths males.

Include more competent women!

Education of the president.

That women take course work dealing with administrative responsibilities.

Continual pursuit of "new blood" of women on the faculty and administration. Our ratio of women/men is still small.

Perseverance; constantly raising the consciousness of men; questioning openly decisions, policies and procedures.

I do not know.

Reclassification of positions in such a way that there is a clear path to advancement. Also hiring more females for top positions.

It's the "chicken or the egg"; women won't advance until they hold more power positions, but they won't get those without advancement. Taking the power from the men is the answer--but I don't know how.

What is necessary is consciousness raising. I do not believe that most discrimination is deliberate: I find rather an attitude of surprise that women are competent. I also find that men do appreciate ideas etc. which women express and then are given credit for them. How to deal with the problem without becoming a "nag" is of great importance.

Sex equity in salary.

Become less passive and let it be known that you are interested in administration.

This is not a problem!

Reeducate some of the male administrators (patronizing).

If we could search until we find the right female for the job (major administrators), then the successes of such women would overcome the entrenched thinking. Obviously, easier said than done (not to mention reverse discrimination).

When being considered for a promotion/position, gender should not enter into the decision. Usually if a female is married, her salary is not as high as a male counterpart.

Better, more open communication of information (financial, planning, policy).

More active involvement and assertiveness by women.

Regular information sessions; more delineation of roles.

No women in nonteaching administrative positions to assist those in teaching administrative positions.

Removing some top administrators.

Fire the college president (this is no joke).

Increase the number of women as faculty and as administrators so women have voting clout.

Change philosophical viewpoint of president of college.

Keep pushing, with good humor.

I feel there are few, if any, barriers at my institution.

Treat me as a colleague who has just as valuable contributions to make as any man. Let's be open minded on both sides.

Representation of women on the president's executive committee.

There are too many conservative men in this faculty. We need to hire more open-minded men, and more women who are assertive.

Educate more women in their denomination.

Persistence; making my presence known until they're so used to me they forget about my femaleness. Get more women into administrative office at higher levels.

There are none here--now--for persons in my position.

To institute a mentoring system...to hire more females.

There are few barriers that need "breaking down"; in fact, that attitude is a bigger problem.

Faculty status for all female library staff who need to deal with teachers as academic peers.

Faculty development in women's studies: More women's studies in curriculum. (Administration is less of a problem; faculty and students are more conservative and sexist here than in most places.)

Since salaries of individuals are not known, it is difficult to determine if there's a real difference.

Leave before you're stuck.

I'm afraid we'd had to reprogram the minds of our "old guard" before any recommendation would be seriously considered.

Union/faculty control of administrative hiring.

Believe they have the opportunity for advancement.

The academic structure appears fairly open. In the administrative staff there are barriers, but these are attitudinal of one or two key administrators and are gradually looking up.

A different president. In a small institution, the chief executive's comfort in dealing with women is crucial.

Hire more women faculty and staff.

We're working on affirmative action--current officer is inadequate because of other positions.

More clear accountability in different positions--job review--this way we can be judged by our merits, not as "women."

I don't really feel there are any strong barriers.

The "internal" institution, though not perfect, really has no significant barrier. The trustee structure would have to put women in power positions to produce the changes necessary to reduce external barriers.

We need some institutional research to show what happens to women here. Also we need the sunshine law.

We currently have a woman president, well received and respected by all. Her success will open doors for women.

A major attitude change and possibly younger administrators.

Open lines of communication.

Positive seeking out of women to serve as administrators (very little turnover in those positions, though).

New president.

Awareness, which is being worked on.

The entire managerial climate needs to be informed and refreshed.

Get a new president.

Change your sex.

Improved financial conditions.

Recognition of competence is a strong factor here; therefore, continuation of a job well done is the best recommendation.

We need to work hard, be competent, be flexible, and learn the system. It also helps to think like a male.

Perhaps continuing to "play the game" of "backing off" as soon as men feel threatened.

To allow more room for upward mobility in a planned way.



Frankly, I see no such barriers.

Provision for part-time tenure track employment. In my own case it has been enormously helpful.

Administrators and faculty should be kept aware of the need for a larger number of women in key positions.

Since this college has just gone coed, there are more (many more) female administrators and faculty than male.

The barriers are in attitudes of certain faculty, not really administrators. Also would recommend more pay equality.

Educate the men! I am treated as a daughter or a grand-daughter, but rarely a colleague.

Women's network of support.

Impossible with current leadership.

There aren't any.

Change tradition--try it, you'll like it (and we are).

Be excellent at job and savvy.

Who knows?

I'd like to see a commitment to academic and career development and hope resources (dollars, ideas, mentors, sponsors, etc.) could be created and provided for such a program.

Some males have a bias. Frequent committee work with females so bias can be broken down.

Committee work (AAUP).

Actually, none. I believe a qualified woman would be appointed to administrative positions if openings were there. Women have been appointed. The board of directors' president is a woman at least half the time.

Accreditation agencies must examine more closely blatant forms of organizational politics which are so effectively hidden during times of review. Even those against whom prejudice is focused are reluctant to expose those who "pay the bills."

Wait it out until the last of the "old boys" groups retire--of course, long before that one hopes that their numbers would have decreased to a comfortable level--perhaps "old boys" isn't the right word--I mean males who finally don't take women seriously and can't really work with them.

Not a problem.

Be confident. Respect is gained by how you view or see yourself. Be sure of yourself and stand up for yourself.

Get as much formal education and experience, including computer literacy and work extra hard to win confidence of your employer and colleagues. Get involved in committee projects.

More women in positions who don't subconsciously feed the stereotype, i.e., being too emotional, using pregnancy and female disorders as reason for absences, leaves, etc.

None.

Speak with authority. Spout facts, names, statistics.

Active recruitment to increase the number of women in top-level administration. Encouraging women with potential to become educationally prepared.

I'm leaving. No other choice.

Having the few who are administrators do a noticeably good job breaks down barriers.

A change of administration.

Must behave, dress, and speak in a professional manner.

Better communication.

Work on confronting attitudes of sexual bias which might not be obvious. Example: This summer while student help is not available, several staff people have been asked to answer incoming calls (work as switchboard operator/receptionist). All the staff asked to do this were women--no viable reason for not including male staff was given!

Support of women by top administration.

For women to receive education on assertiveness and professional behavior and avoid the misplaced feminism attitudes displayed.

Seriously--leave.

Get more competent, powerful women on the board. Pressure from colleagues for change.

More cooperation and dispelling of the image the women faculty have in nursing--trouble makers.

Hire in new male or female administrators.

Only time will break down the barriers. While we have male administrators whose wives stay home, they will never understand women who have families and work, too.

Pursue graduate education, become fully qualified, engage in scholarly activities.

(1) Hire more qualified women. (2) Attitude-awareness seminar.

Develop climate where honesty is possible--I don't know how specifically, other than encouraging and trying to practice this.

Our institution has a fairly good record of "intentions," the policy is right, yet financing needed to attract women where most needed is inadequate.

I am not convinced the barriers are not changes in the concept of the position rather than in the sex of the officer.

Increase salaries.

People need to look at ability, not gender.

It's a very slow process because attitudes are hard to change. Here as in most places patience and communication are vital. Showing professionalism and competence by initiating things has worked for me.

Don't assume promotion; work on developing skills which transfer. Be patient but voice concerns.

That the sisters who are administrators don't allow convent politics to dictate college policy.

I just don't have any suggestions for breaking down blind prejudice.

Greater commitment on the part of the college to women's studies and women's organizations.

Encourage other women to speak up.

I do not feel my institution has many barriers to women advancing from within. I do think job searches for v-p candidates lean heavily to men. I would not know how to break this down.

Participate with worthwhile ideas and suggestions.

Honest effort to begin more women in tenure track positions.

Female networking.

Fill in for a male administrator on his leave of absence; apply for employment as openings occur in administration.

Attract more outstanding female faculty to tenure track positions (including incentives that aid accomplishment of their dual roles-- e.g., child care, ample maternity leave policies, and schedules that do not eat into evening hours and weekends).

In some respects, it is a hindrance--there are not many women among the faculty or administrators.

More women on the search committees and interviewing process.

To my knowledge, women are treated as equals in this small college.

We haven't any here. All major administrators (including president) are women.

Get a president who recognizes talents of women in administration.

Willingness on the part of administrators to spread leadership on committees more and willingness on the part of women to take those roles.

Women must seek the credentials; must gain the professionalism--The rest is trivial.

Again, I feel well satisfied with perception of women at our institution on a professional level.

I don't know what to suggest. Basically, I have been treated fairly, but there is an undercurrent that reminds me that I am a woman...in other words, not destined for advancement.

Equal pay.

None. Greater percentage of women and they are "listened to."

Advertise job openings nationwide and make the pay attractive.

Hire fewer Methodist ministers as administrators.

Positions in administration: job descriptions more clearly defined.

Open, honest evaluation and discussion of perceptions.

Do a good job.

The president of our college is a woman--advancement requires academic credentials; being a female is not a barrier.

This is a religious-run institution. We need more laymen as well as women in administration to provide a balance.

Hire more females who are competent and enthusiastic.

Become more assertive, learn the language of power and how to play politics. It can be a dirty game--women need to know the rules.

Develop trust among themselves and work as a group.

Professional-development policies developed and implemented.

Recruit more students and more funding.

No problems here that I've seen.

More women involved in administrative policy decision making!

More involvement in networking between both sexes.

Believe in yourself.

This institution better than many as far as respect for current female faculty. Need more female faculty and administrators. Those concerned most need to make selves heard stronger.

More opportunity for faculty dialogue--open exchange of ideas and concerns.

Don't believe there are barriers except for one person who is being pushed.

## APPENDIX G

### WRITTEN COMMENTS BY WOMEN ADMINISTRATORS TO QUESTION 69 ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Question: Do you perceive that the climate/environment and selection process at your present college is one of encouragement and support for women aspiring to advance in administrative positions?

Comments:

It is coming--we have more women now than we had two years ago, but still not enough.

If religious.

It's a weak no, since there is no proof. I do not believe women here are paid as highly as their male colleagues.

Support is not yet strong, but it is there.

They talk out of one side of their mouths and act out of the other--no women in senior administrative positions.

It isn't supportive for anyone, but the bias is overwhelming male.

Will promote a woman to higher position, then create a higher administrative position and hire a man.

Probably about as good as would be normal for a formerly all-male school.

Women hold jobs such as "administrative assistant," looking good on affirmative action reports, but no real power jobs. Women always get these glorified secretarial jobs but no higher positions.

For women who are nuns, yes; for non-nuns, no higher than department chair.

Difficult to tell.

In general (not some individual administrators).

Up to/through the middle-management level at any rate.

I answer yes because I do not perceive a negative climate.

Not overt encouragement noticed.

It is beginning.

Encouraged to do so if money is available in budget.

There is no official position against it, but it seldom happens.

This would change with a change in president. The religious affiliation of this particular college has supported the equality of men and women for the past 350 years.

Department heads are chosen by the administration. Often capable women have been passed over, and men chosen.

No women in top level now, none to be in next round.

Males are viewed as "having the answers."

It is very small. There aren't many positions like mine available. I am one of three division chairs.

I must add here that at this institution, department chairs carry full teaching loads.

The only powerful position held by a woman is academic dean.

But too few women in pipeline, barriers to hiring more (mostly unconscious).

Not in the central administration.

But it's not discouraging either.

But not to the highest administration (i.e., dean). The president of the faculty is a woman.

Top two positions are held by men, but women fill many of the other administrative positions.

Was a woman's college until late 60's--women have always held administrative posts.

Our president is a woman--that helps!

Too many mixed signals--I can't be sure.

Too many "good old boys."

It's subtle--The committees are supposed to do the work; actually it's all done in "good old boy" groups.

Because of the type of college I am at, I tend to be more positive (formerly all-girls school and still predominantly female with large number of women as faculty). If I were somewhere else, I think I would respond differently to some of your questions.

Neither is it negative--more noncommittal.



There are none.

Depends on which level of administration you're talking about--highest levels, no; lower levels, yes!

I am fortunate that I have an academic dean who values women and tries to support and encourage women.

Recently, the woman chair of math department was asked to serve as vice-president for academic affairs (dean of faculty) during sabbatical of male vice-president!

The current administration actively seeks female applicants (recruits them).

I think women are as likely to be encouraged and supported as anyone.

I cannot answer this question on a "yes" or "no" basis. The top administrators seem to value the services of some women, but little opportunity exists for advancement to the top within the institution.

I don't see barriers for women at my institution very often. Sometimes, men have barriers here, too! For example, in the three-year history of faculty assem., there have been no male officers.

Elsewhere--no women in cabinet-level positions.

Not at the present time; it depends on who the top administrators are.

I am really aggravated by the concept that bright, intelligent women ought to be upwardly mobile. I have found the upward track to be emotionally devastating. Life is too short! I'm trying to move downward and enjoy life again.

It's mixed. There are, as everywhere, men in key positions who have a hard time realizing that it's 1985--but the general climate is very favorable.

Little such encouragement for men or women; less for women....

More and more qualifications are recognized.

There is one high administrator who really dislikes all women.

But only \_\_\_\_\_? There's a woman who's the dean of faculty now.

Recently a woman was appointed president. She has made a difference.

Being an engineering school, and engineering field dominated by men, recruitment at T.S.U. is more favorable for men than women.

Theoretically, yes; pragmatically, no.

Better than it used to be.

Increasingly so. It is changing slowly.

Not sure.

There are few women aspiring to such positions here.

Because of limited positions, no one is particularly "encouraged," but I believe women are even less encouraged because of the job/roles they presently hold.

It is yes and no--recently appointed a female vice-president for administrative affairs--but seem to apply double standards for men and women.

For the most part.

Women in power who are not willing to support other women and women colleagues who do not want/or are undecided about what they want, but are still unwilling to support women who do want to advance in administration.

Yes for lower positions since searches are done. No for v.p. positions since three hand picked (all men) in this last year.

Work load for all administrators is horrendous, however, and constitutes a real drawback for a person with a family.

We've had a changeover in administration, and I think now we will be more encouraged to advance.

It's here but not made widely known.

Don't assume promotion within/develop skills which transfer/be patient but voice concerns.

I have more common sense plus "smarts" than anyone here.

You must understand, though, that this institution is an anomaly. It is owned, run, and operated at the highest levels by sisters.

Generally.

There's much talk but no real support.

This is a very strong yes.

Up to v.p. level, yes. Beyond that, no.

Depends on who you are and what you teach.

In a church-related institution, men are viewed as the primary leaders.  
A qualified "yes."

Women do advance, but I perceive it is due to their drive and initiative.

Too many male chauvinists.

If the woman is well qualified and within the constraints of the number of positions open.

System seems to give preference to women and minorities.

For me, given my sponsor--for most women, no.

But there are not many qualified women.

Undecided.

All cabinet members including interim president are women. Also, many other administrators are women.

Except for economic rewards.

This is true not only at the college, it is characteristic of our rural geographical area.

One-half of faculty: nuns.

My knowledge of this is very limited.

I believe the new administration is positive.

Sometimes = the token woman.

It seems to, although I'm new here.

Not necessarily, but hot.

Facts belie lip service.

Little opportunity for advancement for men or women.

For some--yes.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abramson, Joan. The Invisible Woman. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1975.
- Alvarez, Rodolfo. "Institutional Discrimination in Organizations and Their Environments." In Discrimination in Organizations, pp. 2-49. Edited by Rodolfo Alvarez, Kenneth G. Lutterman, and Associates. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1979.
- American Association of University Professors. "The Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession 1983-84." Academe (July-August 1984).
- Astin, Alexander W. "Academic Administration: The Hard Core of Sexism in Academe." UCLA Education 19 (1977): 60-66.
- Astin, Helen S., and Snyder, Mary Beth. "A Decade of Response: Affirmative Action 1972-1982." Change (July-August 1982): 26-31, 59.
- Banfield, Emiko Elaine Cunningham. "Women in Middle Management Positions: Characteristics, Training, Leadership Style, Limitations, Rewards, and Problems." Ph.D. dissertation, United States International University, 1976.
- Bauer, Lois M. "A Study to Investigate Determinants of Levels of Professional Achievement Attained by a Group of Women Administrators Employed in Selected Divisions of Continuing Education in Michigan During the Years 1960-1976." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1978.
- Bernard, Jessie. Academic Women. University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1964.
- Bickel, Sarah L. "Female Aspirants to Higher Education Administration: Barriers Anticipated, Strategies Utilized." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1980.
- Borg, Walter R., and Gall, Meredith D. Educational Research: An Introduction. New York: Longman, Inc., 1983.

Broverman, I. K.; Vogel, S. R.; Broverman, D. M.; Clarkson, F. E.; and Rosenkrantz, P. S. "Sex-Role Stereotypes: A Current Appraisal." The Journal of Social Issues 23(2) (1972): 59-78.

Capps, Julia Anna. "The Roles of Assistant Superintendents and Supervisors in North Carolina Relative to Sex Differences." Ph.D. dissertation, Duke University, 1976.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education. Berkeley: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1976.

Cherryholmes, Lynn. "The Career Aspirations of Female Principals in Michigan." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1978.

Chronicle of Higher Education. "In Box." April 11, 1984, p. 29.

\_\_\_\_\_. January 9, 1985, p. 27. (a)

\_\_\_\_\_. "Calls for Education Reform Spur Professors and Administrators Into Self-Examination." September 4, 1985, p. 45. (b)

College Blue Book, Narrative Descriptions. 19th ed. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., 1983.

Davis, Margaret Carol. "Women Administrators in Southeastern Institutions of Higher Education." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Alabama, 1978.

Douglas, Priscilla Delahunt. "An Analysis of Demographic Characteristics and Career Patterns of Women Administrators in Higher Education." Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Connecticut, 1976.

Douvan, E. "The Role of Models in Women's Professional Development." Psychology of Women Quarterly 1 (Fall 1976): 5-21.

Dressler, Francis. "A Descriptive Study of Women Administrators in Higher Education in San Diego County." Ph.D. dissertation, United States International University, 1981. Dissertation Abstracts International 42 (1981): 472-A.

Education Directory, Colleges and Universities 1983-84. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, 1984.

Engelgau, Donna. "Confronting Social and Philosophical Barriers to the Participation of Women in Science: NSF Supports Role Models." Chronicle of Higher Education, July 5, 1984, pp. 5-6.

- Epstein, C. F. Woman's Place: Options and Limits in Professional Careers. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970.
- Featherstone, Richard L. The Development of Management Systems for the Academic Department. Boulder, Col.: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems at WICHE, 1972.
- Feldman, Saul D. Escape From the Doll House. Women in Graduate and Professional Education. Report prepared for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1974.
- Ferber, Marianne A., and Loeb, Lane W. "Performance, Rewards, and Perceptions of Sex Discrimination Among Male and Female Faculty." American Journal of Sociology 78 (November 1973): 995-1001.
- Fisher, Francine. "A Study of the Relationship Between the Scarcity of Women in Educational Administration Positions and the Multiple Factors Which Influence the Career Aspirations of Women Teachers." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1978.
- Follett, Charlene; Watt, Marianne; and Hansen, L. Sunny. "Selected Review of the Literature on Career Development and Sex-Role Stereotyping at the Postsecondary/Higher Education Level." Project Born Free. Minneapolis: College of Education, University of Minnesota, 1980.
- Forisha, Barbara L. "The Inside and the Outsider: Women in Organizations." In Outsiders on the Inside: Women and Organizations, pp. 9-30. Edited by Barbara Forisha and Barbara Goldman. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Sex Roles and Personal Awareness. Morristown, N.J.: General Learning Press, 1978.
- Freeman, Bonnie Cook. "Faculty Women in the American University: Up the Down Staircase." Higher Education 6 (May 1977): 165-88.
- Fury, Kathleen. "Mentor Mania." Savvy (1980): 43-49.
- Gappa, Judith M., and Uehling, Barbara S. Women in Academe: Steps to Greater Equality. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 1. Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1979.
- Gasser, Mary Helen. "Career Patterns of Women Administrators in Higher Education: Barriers and Constraints." Ph.D. dissertation, Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, 1975.

- Giggleman, Linda J. "A Comparison of the Personality Characteristics of Women Administrators and Women Teachers in Selected Community Colleges." Ph.D. dissertation, East Texas State University, 1978.
- Halcomb, Ruth. "Mentors and the Successful Woman." Across the Board (February 1980): 13-18.
- Harris, Elizabeth Simpkins. "California Women School Superintendents: Characteristics and Trends, 1874-1974." Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1976.
- Hennig, Margaret, and Jardim, Anne. The Managerial Woman. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books, 1981.
- HEP 1985 Higher Education Directory. Washington, D.C.: Higher Education Publications, 1985.
- Holton, Charles J., and Gemmill, Gary R. "A Comparison of Female and Male Professors on Participation in Decision Making, Job Related Tension, Job Involvement, and Job Satisfaction." Educational Administration Quarterly 12 (Winter 1976): 80-93.
- Hull, Jennifer B. "Female Bosses Say Biggest Barriers Are Insecurity and 'Being a Woman.'" The Wall Street Journal, November 2, 1982, pp. 29, 36.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Women Find Parents Need Them Just When Careers Are Resuming." The Wall Street Journal, September 9, 1985, p. 21.
- Josefowitz, Natasha. Paths to Power. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1980.
- Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. Men and Women of the Corporation. New York: Basic Books, 1977.
- Kaplan, Sheila, and Helly, Dorothy O. "An Agenda for Senior Women Administrators." In Women in Higher Education Administration, pp. 67-75. New Directions for Higher Education No. 45. Edited by Adrian Tinsley, Cynthia Secor, and Sheila Kaplan. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, March 1984.
- Karr, Jeanne H. "A Study of Women Professors and the Multiple Factors That Influence Their Career Aspirations to Administrative Positions." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1983. Dissertation Abstracts International 44 (1983): 1060.
- Keogh, Sandra Dunavan. "Sponsorship of the Careers of Women Administrators at Public Institutions of Higher Education." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Mississippi, 1982.



- Kuk, Linda S. "Perceptions of Work Climate and Their Relationship to the Career Aspiration of Women Student Affairs Administrators." Ph.D. dissertation, Iowa State University, 1981. Dissertation Abstracts International 42 (1981): 1408-A.
- Lasden, Martin. "A Mentor Can Be a Millstone." Computer Decisions, March 26, 1985, pp. 74-81.
- Lenny, Mary Ruth. "Determination of the Opportunities for Upward Mobility of Women to Positions of Authority in Three Illinois Public Community Colleges." Ph.D. dissertation, St. Louis University, 1980. Dissertation Abstracts International 42 (1980): 1408-A.
- Levinson, Daniel J. The Seasons of a Man's Life. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978.
- Mann, Barbara Ann. "Career Sponsorship of Women Senior-Level Administrators in Higher Education." Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University, 1980. Dissertation Abstracts International 41 (1980): 961.
- Matteson, Michael T. "Attitudes Toward Women as Managers: Sex or Role-Differences?" Psychological Reports 39 (1976): 166.
- Mayer, Jane. "Unfair Shake? Women Charge They Don't Get Their Share of White House Jobs." The Wall Street Journal, September 10, 1985, pp. 1, 25.
- McNutt, Anne Shoemaker. "A Study of the Role Models of Top-Echelon Women Administrators in Southern Public Institutions of Higher Education." Ph.D. dissertation, East Tennessee State University, 1979.
- Michigan State Board of Education. Directory of Michigan Institutions of Higher Education. Lansing: Higher Education Management Services, Michigan State Department of Education, 1983-84.
- Mills-Novoa, Beverly Ann. "A Study of Selected Variables Affecting the Career Progression of Women in Higher Education Administration." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1980.
- Missirian, Agnes K. "The Process of Mentoring in the Career Development of Female Managers." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1980.
- Moore, Diane. "California Community College Women Administrators: A Study of Mentors and Proteges." Ph.D. dissertation, University of LaVerne, 1983.

- Moore, Kathryn M. "Careers in College and University Administration: How Are Women Affected?" In Women in Higher Education Administration, pp. 5-15. New Directions for Higher Education No. 45. Edited by Adrian Tinsley, Cynthia Secor, and Sheila Kaplan. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, March 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Salimbene, Ann M. "The Dynamics of the Mentor-Protege Relationship in Developing Women as Academic Leaders." Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership 2 (Fall 1981): 51-64.
- National Project on Women in Education. "No Room at the Top." American Education 13 (June 1977): 21-26.
- Nie, Norman H., et al. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Orlich, Donald C. Designing Sensible Surveys. Pleasantville, N.Y.: Redgrave Publishing Co., 1978.
- Orr, Bea. "The Role of the Woman Mentor in Today's Professional Life." Address given at the 1984 conference of the Midwest Association for College and University Physical Education, Angola, Indiana, October 13, 1984.
- Ott, Margaret S. "Expressed Attitudes Toward Women in Educational Administration." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, 1983.
- Pacheco, Betty Ann. "Barriers to Advancement in Educational Administration as Perceived by Women Administrators." Ph.D. dissertation, University of the Pacific, 1982.
- Palley, Marian. "Women as Academic Administrators in the Age of Affirmative Action." Journal of NAWDAC 42 (Fall 1978): 3-9.
- Patterson, Patricia L. "A Description and Analysis of the Women Faculty in Pennsylvania's State-Owned Colleges and Universities." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1974.
- Perry, Suzanne. "Women Administrators Say They Still Battle to Win Acceptance From Male Colleagues." Chronicle of Higher Education, March 30, 1983, pp. 27, 30.
- Phillips, Linda Lee. "Mentors and Proteges: A Study of the Career Development of Women Managers and Executives in Business and Industry." Ph.D. dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1977.

- Piggott, Lucille Johnson. "The Social Characteristics and Career Patterns of Women Administrators in North Carolina Colleges and Universities." Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1979.
- Pulliam, Patricia Chapman. "An Ethnographic Study of Three Women Deans: Their Role Enactment and Role Perception." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1984.
- Ralston, Yvonne Louise. "An Analysis of Attitudes as Barriers to the Selection of Women as College Presidents in Florida." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Mississippi, 1974.
- Rogan, Helen. "Women Executives Feel That Men Both Aid and Hinder Their Careers." The Wall Street Journal, October 29, 1984, pp. 31, 49.
- Rosenkrantz, Paul S.; Vogel, S. R.; Bee, H.; Broverman, I. K.; and Broverman, D. M. "Sex-Role Stereotypes and Self-Concepts in College Students." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 32 (1968): 287-95.
- Safillos-Rothschild, Constantina. "Women and Work: Policy Implications and Prospects for the Future." In Women Working: Theories and Facts in Perspective, pp. 418-32. Edited by Ann H. Stromberg and Shirley Harkess. Palo Alto, Calif.: Mayfield Publishing Co., 1978.
- Sandler, Bernice R. "Backlash in Academe: A Critique of the Lester Report." Teachers College Record 76 (February 1975): 401-19.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Quiet Revolution on Campus: How Sex Discrimination Has Changed." Chronicle of Higher Education, February 29, 1984, p. 72.
- Schetlin, Eleanor. "Wonderland and Looking-Glass: Women in Administration." Journal of NAWDAC (Spring 1975): 104-109.
- Schlack, Marilyn Joyce. "A Comparison of Personal Characteristics and Leadership Styles of University Upper-Management and Middle-Management Women Student Personnel Administrators." Ph.D. dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1974.
- Schmuck, Patricia A. "Deterrents to Women's Careers in School Management." Sex Roles 1 (1975): 339-53.

- Scott, Ann. "The Half-Eaten Apple: A Look at Sex Discrimination in the University." Reporter (State University of New York at Buffalo), May 14, 1970, pp. 1-8. Also in Robinson, Lora H. "Institutional Variation in the Status of Academic Women." In Academic Women on the Move, p. 199. Edited by Alice S. Rossi and Ann Calderwood. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1973.
- Scott, Patricia L. "Moving Up the Institutional Hierarchy: Some Suggestions for Young Minorities and Women Professionals From the Notebook of a Novice." Journal of NAWDAC (Winter 1979): 34-39.
- Shapiro, Ellen C.; Haseltine, Florence P.; and Rose, Mary P. "Moving Up: Role Models, Mentors, and the 'Patron System.'" Sloan Management Review (Spring 1978): 51-58.
- Sheehy, Gail. Passages. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1976.
- Shur, Norman W. English English. Essex, Conn.: Verbatim Books, 1980.
- Stent, Angela. "Academe's New Girl Network." Change (June-July 1978): 18-21.
- Stevenson, Florence. "Women Administrators in Big Ten Universities." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1973.
- Stokes, M. Jean. "Professional Development Needs and Organizational Constraints Reported by Women Administrators in the State Universities of Florida." Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University 1981. Dissertation Abstracts International (1981): 4203.
- Tyler, Helen Irene. "Personal Characteristics and Career Paths of Selected Women Administrators in Higher Education." Ph.D. dissertation, Kent State University, 1979. Dissertation Abstracts International 40 (1980): 5685-A.
- Unger, Rhoda Kesler, and Denmark, Florence L. Woman: Dependent or Independent Variable? New York: Psychological Dimensions, 1975.
- Villani, Susan. "Mentoring and Sponsoring As Ways for Women to Overcome Internal Barriers to Heightened Career Aspirations and Achievement." Ph.D. dissertation, Northeastern University, 1983.
- Walker, Doris McEwen. "Factors Affecting the Advancement of Women Within Educational Administration." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1981.

- Watkins, Beverly. "Number of Women College Presidents Has Doubled in Decade, Study Finds." Chronicle of Higher Education, September 18, 1985, pp. 1, 33.
- Way, Joyce. "A Comparison of Background Profiles, Career Expectations and Career Aspirations of Men and Women Public School Administrators." Ph.D. dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1976.
- Wolman, Carol, and Frank, Hal. "The Solo Woman in a Professional Peer Group." American Journal of Orthopsychiatry 45 (January 1975): 164-71.
- Woods, Bennie Burks. "Significant Characteristics of Professional Women Employed in Public Two-Year and Four-Year Higher Education Institutions in Michigan." Ph.D. dissertation, Michigan State University, 1979.
- Yearbook of Higher Education. Chicago: Marquis Academic Media, Marquis Who's Who, 1984-85.
- Young, Elizabeth Thompson. "A Study of the Opinions of Deans and Faculty Members Toward the Effectiveness of Women Department Chairmen in Higher Education." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern Mississippi, 1974.