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ABSTRACT

This review of literature will focus on barriers that women face in the quest of leadership positions and success. There are several areas of bias that contribute to the leadership gap included in the content. The information presented in this chapter is general in nature, however allows the reader to fully understand the various obstacles that women face in leadership. This review of the literature and related research has been focused on the following topics: (a) gender differences and stereotypes; (c) hiring/firing practices and legal issues; (d) promotional advancements; (e) mentoring and networking; (f) balancing of home and family life; (g) feminist theory; (h) gender and sexual harassment; (i) career paths; and (j) barriers for multicultural women.

As a result of gender stereotypes and differences in leadership styles, women have encountered more obstacles than men in their quest to be seen as effective leaders. Minority women may encounter multicultural barriers in addition to the barriers that all women face. According to Chemers (1997), minority leaders have had a more difficult time being promoted than non-minority leaders. However, “there is little indication that minority leaders differ dramatically from dominant culture leaders in behavior, performance, or subordinate satisfaction” (p. 150).

What does gender have to do with it? An analysis of barriers women face in leadership

## Introduction

According to Wenninger & Conroy (2001), higher education was born of a tradition of patriarchy and populated by a society disrespectful towards women. The Bill of Rights for Women in Higher Education edited by Wenninger & Conroy presented a succinct list of rights that all women in higher education should be granted.

1. We have the right to be taught as we want to learn, respecting that there are multiple, valid paths to wisdom-not only the classical, hierarchical, step-by- step method-in both careers and classes on campus.
2. We have the right to have our opinions and our life experiences valued and respected.
3. We have the right to enjoy classes and jobs free of sexism and gender discrimination.
4. We have the right to enjoy classes and jobs free of sexual harassment.
5. We have the right to expect opportunities to be unrestricted by our gender in all things on campus, including but not limited to administration, admissions, financial aid, health services, degree requirements, funding, career advice and job placements, tenure, promotion, salary, decision making, research, teaching in the classroom and elsewhere, and sports participation and administration.
6. We have the right to place a value on family and personal life without deprecating our commitment to our careers.
7. We have the right to support those actions that reflect our values and reject those actions that contradict them.
8. We have the right to conduct research in a manner harmonious with both the discipline and subjects, rejecting arbitrary standards that undervalue qualitative and participative studies.
9. We have the right to value cooperation and collaboration to the same extent that we value individual competition and aggression.
10. We have the right to be judged by equitable standards that favor neither gender. (p. xxi)

The need for a bill of rights for women in the higher education field emerged due to the many barriers placed before women throughout history. Several different discrimination practices by colleges and universities have been the cause of these barriers. This review of the literature and related research has been focused on the following topics related to discrimination against women in education: (a) gender differences; (b) gender stereotypes; (c) hiring/firing practices and legal issues; (d) promotional and tenure advancements; (e) mentoring and networking; (f) balancing of home and family life; (g) feminist theory; (h) sexual harassment; (i) career paths; and (j) barriers for multicultural, lesbian and Catholic women.

## Gender Differences

This section provides an analysis of higher education administration and addresses the differences between male and female leadership styles including leadership abilities of female and male higher education administrators. Also presented are obstacles women have faced in obtaining administrative positions. According to Rosener (1990), females and males have exhibited inherently different leadership styles. This has resulted in differing views on what leadership means.

Gender paradigms of personality traits have been separated by some researchers into nurturing (feminine) and defensive/aggressive (masculine). Nurturing traits included caring, creative, intuitive, awareness of individual differences, non-competitive, tolerant, subjective and informal. Defensive/aggressive traits included highly regulated, conformist, normative, competitive, evaluative, disciplined, objective, and formal. The latter traits helped individuals protect themselves from being emotionally exposed. These defensive or aggressive traits tended to be directed toward others rather than internally directed (Gray, 1993).

Female leadership practice has been connected to transformational leadership and communal characteristics. Female leaders have tended to practice transformational leadership, a form of leadership that was not seen as traditional. Major theories of male leadership practice have more often included descriptors such as transactional leadership and agentic characteristics (Bem, 1974; Rosener, 1990; Ruble, 1983). Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt (2001) discussed agentic characteristics and behaviors:

Agentic characteristics, which are ascribed more strongly to men than women, describe primarily an assertive, controlling, and confident tendency-for example, aggressive, ambitious, dominant, forceful, independent, daring, self-confident, and competitive. In employment settings, agentic behaviors might include speaking assertively, competing for attention, influencing others, initiating activity directed to assigned tasks, and making problem-focused suggestions. (p. 783)

This difference in leadership style may have been seen as detrimental to female leaders by some people, for their leadership style did not follow the stereotypical definition of leadership. Consequently, historical male leadership behaviors exhibited by males and females have been viewed less positively when performed by a woman (Eagly, Makhijani & Klonsky, 1992).

Feingold (1994) performed four meta-analyses regarding gender differences in personality. He found that “Males were found to be more assertive and had slightly higher self-esteem than females. Females were higher than males in extraversion, anxiety, trust, and, especially, tender-mindedness (e.g., nurturance)” (p. 429). He also stated that males had higher scores than females on agentic traits and that females scored higher than males on communal traits, indicating in his words that “The personality dimensions that most strongly differentiated between the sexes were assertiveness and tender mindedness, which are nearly pure measures of agency and communality, respectively” (pp. 449-450). Men have also been more likely to be boastful and promote themselves (“Getting Recognized,” 2001). For administrators, this type of behavior may have included competing for attention, influencing colleagues, and speaking assertively (Eagly, Wood, & Diekman, 2000).

Females have tended to reflect a communal style of leadership. This included a cultivation of strong interpersonal relationships, flexibility, shared decision-making, and reflection (Burns, 1978). Other qualities included a concern for the welfare of others, sensitivity, and compassion (Chemers, 1997). In the workforce, communal characteristics may include speaking tentatively, not focusing attention to oneself, following the direction of others, supporting and comforting colleagues, and solving problems among group members (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001).

Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt (2001) stated that there have often been inconsistencies with the communal qualities that have been associated with the female gender and the agentic and male-dominated qualities that were commonly associated with successful leadership. When men and women lead in a similar way, they have often been perceived differently. This incongruity between the gender characteristics that females tended to maintain and the roles ascribed to typical leaders may have created prejudice toward female leaders despite their success. For example, when a female and male administrator walked into a room, one often mistook the female for the male’s support person or junior colleague (Sandler, 1986).

Traditional masculine behaviors such as aggressiveness and authority have been considered to be desirable leadership qualities but have not been associated with being feminine. Hence, women not exhibiting these qualities may not have appeared to be good candidates for executive positions and may have been passed over for positions (Mitchell, 1993). Chliwniak (1996) summarized that it might not be the ability or the behavior of the woman that created the gender gap but rather the leadership and stereotypical gender norms that society maintained towards the traditional definition of leadership.

Women may have received less favorable evaluations in leadership potential and leadership ability because leadership ability was more stereotypical of men than of women. This prejudice was drawn from two norms. The first norm was that the characteristics were unlike the qualities expected and desired in leaders. The second norm stemmed from gender roles or the activation of beliefs of how women should have behaved. Hence, if women conformed to their gender role, it may have produced a failure to meet the requirements of their leadership role and vice versa (Eagly & Karau, 2001). As a result, women may have been thought of as more blunt, transparent, less objective, less flexible, more forthright, and having lower emotional control than men (Hagberg Consulting Group, 1998).

Male leaders tended to describe their job performances as a chain of transactions in which staff members were punished or praised according to their poor or exceptional behavior and/or performances. Female leaders conversely supported collective participation, sharing power and respect with others. (Rosener, 1990). Sandler (1986) observed that due to these less aggressive traits, women were more likely to be interrupted than males. In discussion groups, people were more likely to respond longer to a male’s remarks than to those of a female. People were also more attentive when a male was speaking in a group and were more likely to recognize men in non-verbal mannerisms than women.

As a result of gender stereotypes and differences in leadership styles, women have encountered more obstacles than men in their quest to be seen as effective leaders. Koesler (1994) stated that when females learned they did so first by observation and then by doing, whereas males tended to learn first by immediately having engaged in the task before them. This may be caused by competitive differences with males having been internally driven by competition while females were driven by a sense of personal skill development. Women may have been seen as more passive due to this difference. Differences in learning styles may also provide an explanation for the observation of Carli & Eagly (2001) that “Females are generally presumed to be less competent than males and therefore less credible as influence agents” (pp. 632-633).

In a research study by Koesler and Tyson (1996), it was shown that men were more commanding when they were showing leadership traits and often challenged the effectiveness of the leadership abilities shown by the females in the group. Also, the men in the group often refused to recognize their female colleagues as equals. Women showed fewer hierarchical traits, were more cooperative and collaborative, and enhanced each other’s self-worth (Book, 2000; Helgesen, 1990; Rosener, 1995).

Peters (2002) suggested that women had tendencies to not put on a “game face” in tough situations and that they did not take risks as often as men, being more cautious in their leadership style. Peters believed that women would be more successful if they learned to present their proposals and ideas with less passion.

McGinty (1995) noted that women could increase their confidence and marketability in reaching higher leadership roles by learning how to become successful networkers, volunteer for difficult assignments, and position themselves so that they would be viewed as a central player within the organization. This included meeting as many other people as possible from all types of positions and industries. Women have been encouraged to keep track of their work successes, complimentary letters, and important letters; to discuss their accomplishments, committees and women organizations that they served in public to boost their resume (“Getting Recognized,” 2001).

 In reviewing survey results of female and male leaders, female leaders’ styles have often been determined to be more effective than those of males. Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt (2001) surveyed a large sample of predominantly USA managers using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. Of the 9,000 questionnaires received, 2,874 were answered by female managers, while 6,126 questionnaires were answered by male managers. These managers were rated by superiors and subordinates and also completed the survey themselves. The researchers summarized their findings as follows:

Women exceeded men on three transformational scales: the attributes version of idealized influence, inspirational motivation, and individualized consideration. These findings suggest that the female managers, more then the male managers, (1) manifested attributes that motivated their followers to feel respect and pride because of their association with them, (2) showed optimism and excitement about future goals, and (3) attempted to develop and mentor followers and attend to their individual needs. (p. 791)

Women also ranked higher then men in one area of transactional rewards, that of rewarding subordinates for good performance. The communal characteristic that showed the highest difference between male and female performance was individualized consideration of others. Females outperformed males in this area.

 On the other hand, male managers scored higher than females in most transactional areas of management. “These findings suggest that male managers, more then female managers, (1) paid attention to their followers’ problems and mistakes, (2) waited until problems became severe before attempting to solve them, and (3) were absent and uninvolved at critical times” (Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt, 2001, p. 793).

 Eagly & Johannesen-Schmidt further elaborated on their findings in the following statement:

Both women’s higher scores on the transformational subscales and contingent reward and men’s higher scores on passive management-by-exception and laissez-faire leadership suggest that the female managers in this norming sample were more effective than the male managers. In support of this conclusion, the women in the norming sample scored significantly higher then the men on a measure of perceived effectiveness. (p. 791)

In building and structuring leadership organizations, women leaders tended to have a more participative style of leading others and thus created a web of inclusion rather than the transactional, male-dominated hierarchical leadership style. (Helgesen, 1990). Overall, women were counseled to not ask how they could change themselves to fit the leadership role. Rather, they were encouraged to ask how their talents and abilities as a female leader could match the needs of the organization and benefit all involved (Wenninger & Conroy, 2001).

## Hiring/Firing Practices and Legal Issues

Much has changed since 1933 when Franklin D. Roosevelt supported the premise that married women should be fired before men in the federal workplace (Gruber, 2002). One change that assisted women to improve their status in the workforce was affirmative action. Affirmative action began with Executive Order 12246 in 1965 in conjunction with Title VII under the Civil Rights Act, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. This act, however, specifically exempted faculty and administrators. Employees of educational institutions were included in the population only after President Nixon amended Title VII in 1972 with the Equal Opportunity Act. This order allowed federal employees to implement affirmative action to make certain that all applicants were treated equally. Affirmative action was used as a voluntary effort to relieve the effect of societal discrimination (Furniss & Graham, 1974).

Beginning in 1968, colleges and universities began to sense pressure to develop policies regarding affirmative action that would improve employment opportunities for females at their institutions. Institutions had previously received pressure to construct policies regarding minority groups, but these policies for minorities did not include employment opportunities for women. For instance, anti-nepotism rules, were not especially detrimental to men, but they were for women, specifically those who were married to men in the same field (The Carnegie Commission for Higher Education, 1973).

In 1970, 18 colleges and universities were being investigated by the Office for Civil Rights in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW). As a result, HEW issued nine requirements with which colleges and universities would have to comply in order to receive federal funds. First, institutions needed to have salary equity in every job class on campus. Second, every female who had lost salary money, due to discrimination, would be awarded back pay. Third, the ratio of female employees in positions needed to be equivalent to the number of qualified female applicants for these positions. Fourth, female admissions to all doctoral graduate programs needed to increase. Fifth, a larger number of female members was needed to serve on committees charged with the selection and treatment of institutional employees. Sixth, nepotism policies needed to be written. Seventh, institutions were required to retroactively pay damages to females who suffered from anti-nepotism policies. Eighth, separate female and male job descriptions were to be erased, and all females were to be given equal consideration for jobs that matched their qualifications. Ninth, all female employees in nonacademic positions who possessed qualifications equal or superior to those of males in higher positions were to be given first consideration for advancement (The Carnegie Commission for Higher Education, 1973).

Pressure initially sensed by institutions for female equality largely came from female activist groups on campus or in the community. In 1970, the federal government increased its role in affirmative action for women when a women’s civil rights group, The Women’s Equity Action League (WEAL), filed a suit against all academic institutions. WEAL filed suit by having stated that the academic community discriminated based on gender across the entire industry (The Carnegie Commission for Higher Education, 1973). Dr. Bernice Sandler, the chair for the WEAL Action Committee for Federal Contract Compliance, was instrumental in charging more than 250 institutions with discrimination (Chamberlain, 1988). This action was the first major breakthrough regarding anti-discrimination for women in education administration (Konek, Kitch, & Hammond, 1980).

Women in academia responded with much enthusiasm to the WEAL efforts. In the 1970s, women faculty were part of a pyramidal ranking system and were given less money than their male counterparts for equal work. Also, only 42% of women held tenure in comparison to 60% of men (Chamberlain, 1988).

A revised Executive Order, in 1971, stated that all institutions employing 50 or more persons, and receiving $50,000 or more in federal funds, were required to have affirmative action plans. Initially, this order only applied to private institutions, but in 1973 this order was amended to include public institutions as well. These orders were enforced by HEW. HEW had the power to deny funds from being granted to any institution that did not comply with the orders (The Carnegie Commission for Higher Education, 1973). Since these governmental policies were passed, affirmative action has expanded career opportunities and resulted in higher wages and promotional opportunities for qualified women.

In the early to mid 1970s, anti-nepotism rules were dropped from many colleges and universities largely because of the increased need for qualified teachers, compliance with affirmative action rules, and pressure from feminists (Dagg, 1993). Few colleges and universities expressly forbade hiring females who were married to male employees, although schools may have forbidden one partner to directly supervise another partner or to be involved with tenure, promotion, or salary increases of their partner (Burgan et al., 1991; Mangan, 1989). Hiring trailing partners served the affirmative action need of recruiting women, for one member of the recruiting partnership was usually a woman; but when a female was the prospective hire and a male was the trailing partner, the male partner may have been favored over equally or more qualified female candidates (Burgan et al.).

At the end of the 1970s, female movements had taken on different meanings at universities. Decreased discrimination among faculty and staff, more female athletics, creations of women’s centers, and increased opportunities overall had surfaced (Spitzberg, 1992). However, the term “affirmative action” often provoked negative reactions from individuals. If, for example, a woman was thought to have been hired as a result of affirmative action, it was sometimes assumed that the committee had lowered hiring standards (Miller, 2000).

## Impacts on Female Trailing Partners

Gappa et al. (1979) concluded that 40% of academic women were single, and at highly selective institutions the number was raised to over 55%; however, only 8% of male academics were single at the same universities. Of the married women at these institutions, 88% had husbands with professional or doctoral degrees.

As more women became academic scholars, universities continued to explore the option of partner hiring. Because more women were attending graduate school, the commonality of academic partnerships was subsequently increased (Mangan, 1989). When the woman was the trailing partner, she not only faced a disruption in her own academic career but encountered other psychological stresses as well. In a 1992 study, women were found to interrupt their careers more often because of a husband’s change in location than because of pregnancy and child rearing combined. In fact, a woman was three times more likely to interrupt her academic path for her partner’s career than for maternity (McElrath, 1992).

When a female followed her husband’s career path, she risked not being able to find employment in her chosen field, or in any educational field, depending on the location of the employment chosen by her partner. She may have lost career contacts, income, professional status, and identity if she did not keep abreast of her academic field (Mangan, 1989). Tenured females who interrupted their careers for their husbands’ careers took longer to obtain their tenure and rank than did their female colleagues who had not interrupted their careers. Speculation to as why this occurred was that interruptions in career might have been perceived as a lack of dedication and a liability factor for the institution (Helmick, Sypher, and Hummert, 1992; McElrath, 1992).

Females may also have encountered a lack of self-esteem and control in their lives as a result of not finding employment in their field (Neims, 1986). Both males and females derived self-esteem more from their work accomplishments than their home life accomplishments; and women who worked reported greater self-esteem effectiveness, and well being (Pepitone-Rockwell, 1980). Thus, when it was not their choice to be out of work, self-esteem concerns were justified by females (Schwartzberg & Dytell, 1996).

 Women left their place of employment often because the male in the relationship relocated due to job changes or promotions. This relocation was sometimes made despite the ill effects that relocating caused for the partner and family members (Neims, 1986). Sweet & Moen (2004) stated that if couples found work or kept jobs at the same institution, both were more likely to place an equal priority on both careers in the relationship. Those couples who did not work at the same institution tended to place priority on the husband’s career. In a study by McElrath (1992), 300 female and 300 male faculty members who were members of three different sociology associations were surveyed. McElrath concluded that only 5% of males left academic positions for the female in a relationship, while 21% of females left academic positions for their husbands even when the female was earning a higher salary.

After the relocation process, 31% of women who were out of work were not employed but would have preferred to be employed. Speculation as to why these women were not working included lack of job opportunities in the female’s chosen field, lower than expected salary offers, and psychological hindrances (Neims, 1986).

 Barbee & Cunningham (1990) affirmed that when a female was the trailing partner, more grievances were expressed by the female academics. Females believed that, when a department was recruiting a female and the male was the trailing partner, the department was more likely to strive to satisfy the husband’s job requests than if the male was the candidate. These females believed that the female trailing partners were more likely to be offered part-time work, half pay for full-time work, fewer benefits, and were assumed to be more accessible to the institution. In a study by Dagg (1993), findings stated that almost 20% of females believed that they were exploited by the universities and colleges because the departments offered them less money than males received. These findings have sometimes provoked both partners to leave areas of employment, for the female may not have been satisfied with her work environment. Wilson (2000) emphasized that when a female was the top candidate in the search, husbands were less likely to follow their wives without a guaranteed job. Hence, partner hires were more common in these circumstances.

## Promotional and Tenure Advancements

The “glass ceiling” is a term used to describe a barrier encountered by women in administrative and managerial roles. It has been defined as “an invisible, yet powerful obstruction to women who seek top-level positions in their organizations” (Manuel et al., 1999, p. 3).

As of 1996, 46% of the workers outside the home were female, and more than half of all women in the United States worked full-time. Yet, researchers have shown that women’s advancement, within five or six years of entering the workforce, has not kept pace with that of men (Catalyst, 1998). It was at this professional stage, when many men started advancing at a quick rate, and into higher positions, that women did not. This sometimes resulted in women who voluntarily left their positions. Catalyst noted that universities and colleges, knowingly and unknowingly, created environments that disadvantaged women employees.

In a foreword written for Martin (2000), Gloria Steinham stated that the number of male tenured faculty was increasing 30% faster than the number of tenured women at the turn of the 21st century. Even though more than 50% of the student population was female, most male faculty members in the university were tenured, and most female faculty members were not. Women were more likely to hold teaching positions than research positions. This may have caused fewer tenure opportunities for women. Women, however, were found by Yao (1999) to be less interested overall in self-advancement. Women were also less likely than men to have taken advantage of research opportunities and to have believed in the importance of prestige and status.

As of 2000, Wenninger & Conroy (2001) reported that, in institutions of higher education throughout the United States, 24% of full-time faculty were women, yet the road to tenure has been slower. Only 45% of women faculty members were on a tenure track. Of the faculty pool, 72% of male faculty members and 48% of female faculty members were tenured. The increase of females who gained tenure between 1980 and 2000 rose by only 1.5%, while males who earned tenure increased by 8%. In explaining these differences, some researchers have indicated that women may have spent more time teaching and advising students rather than conducting research. In comparison, males have been reported to spend more time researching than teaching and advising (Wenninger & Conroy, 2001). Female faculty members, according to Simeone (1987), were more likely to publish alone, while men collaborated through their networks to publish more often. Men often networked with other men in their field informally to obtain these collaborations.

As previously stated, tenure was defined as the “method to protect academic freedom of the individual professor” (Chamberlain, 1988, p. 178). On average, women in the United States were less likely to have been tenured than men. Delaware had the statistically lowest number of tenured women with 61% of men and only 28% of females being tenured. Nine states (Alabama, California, Connecticut, Florida, Illinois, New Jersey, Oregon, Rhone Island and Washington State) had a majority of female faculty members who were tenured. In 1985, the American Council on Education researched tenure rates for men and women. Tenured women made up 46% of full-time faculty members and were less likely to have been tenured than men in all 50 states. Percentages by state were detailed. Only 10% of female Alaskan professors working full-time were tenured, while 68% of Californian full-time female professors were granted tenure (Touchton & Davis, 1991).

Catalyst (1998) identified the following as powerful barriers to women striving to advance in their careers.

1. Negative assumptions in executive ranks about women, their abilities, and their commitment to careers
2. Perceptions that women don’t fit with the corporate culture
3. Lack of career planning and the range of job experiences commensurate with the future needs of the organization
4. Lack of core opportunities for female employees who have management potential
5. Assumption that women will not relocate for career advancement
6. Failure to make managers accountable for advancing women
7. Management reluctance to giving women line (that is, revenue-generating) experience
8. Absence of, or too limited, succession planning
9. “Negative mentoring” and self-selection where women move into staff areas of line positions
10. Lack of mentoring and exclusion from informal career networks, where men have typically learned the unwritten rules of success
11. Appraisal and compensation systems that are not uniform for men and women
12. Corporate systems designed prior to women’s large-scale infusion into the workplace, such as benefits systems and productivity measures that don’t take into account new policies such as flexible work arrangements
13. Other forms of “cultural discouragement,” like a work environment that values long hours over actual performance or that offers limited support for work-family initiatives and limited commitment to diversity programs in general
14. Discrimination and sexual harassment. (pp. xxi-xxii)

Yao (1999) wrote that the fact that fewer women than men were tenured was the fault of the schools. Institutions, even research universities, encouraged women in teaching and service above and beyond rather than encouraging valued research. Martin (2000) stated that the usual reason women were not tenured as frequently as were men was because of a lack of qualified candidates. He further explained that “it is true that some fields filter out women so efficiently that few end up in the pool from which the professoriate is ultimately drawn” (pp. 91-92).

Men and women did not agree as to why men advanced faster than women according to a survey conducted by Nelson and Burke (2000) of 325 CEOs and 461 women at the level of vice president or above. Men ranked lack of management experience and overall years in the profession as the most likely reasons. Women, on the other hand, ranked stereotypes, preconceptions, and exclusion from informal networks as the most prominent barriers to advancement. “The fact that male CEOs and women executives do not agree on the stumbling blocks women face may exacerbate the challenges facing managerial women who want to move up in organizations” (p. 108).

As of 1998, according to the American Council on Education’s Office of Women in Higher Education, 19.3% of presidents in higher education institutions in the United States and approximately 33% of department chairs were women, (Wenninger & Conroy, 2001). The American Council on Education issued a report on The American College President in 2006 and stated that “the percentage of presidents who were women more than doubled, from 10 percent in 1986 to 23 percent of the total in 2006, but women's progress has slowed in recent years” (p. 1).

In 1998, women were least likely to be presidents of private doctoral-granting institutions, where only 13.2% of the presidents in these institutions were women (Ross & Green, 2000). However, women were more likely to be chief academic officers at smaller schools. Of the women presidents, 71% worked at schools with 3000 or fewer students. However, the largest percentage (27%) of women presidents were located at private 2-year institutions (Wenninger & Conroy, 2001). On the other hand, female faculty members were less likely to have been granted tenure at private than at public institutions (Touchton & Davis, 1991).

In examining women’s progression from an historical perspective, women tended to become less visible in the higher levels of higher education administration as a result of the abolition of the “dean of women” positions in the 1970s. Deans of students began to oversee both men and women students. This change, in turn, led to more male administrators (Carnegie Commission for Higher Education, 1973).

Glazer-Raymo (1999) said that “the organizational culture must change, beginning with an end to the ‘old boys’ club attitude,’ which still pervades university administration in many universities” (p. 163). The majority of male administrators were Caucasian, between 40 and 50 years of age, married, and had obtained advanced collegiate degrees. Faculty members mirrored these same characteristics (Green, 2000).

In her foreword written for Martin (2000), Steinham stated that the freedom for women to grow was not seen in academe as much as in the corporate world. She indicated that business women had become entrepreneurs at three times the rate of men, but faculty women did not have an equivalent freedom of opportunity. She noted that in business, promotion is often measured in a more objective manner. Some of the factors affecting promotion and tenure in academe are more subjective. In education, good teachers who receive high evaluations have often not been tenured if their productivity in research was perceived to be lower than expected. Another reason why women may not have been tenured, according to Steinham, was they were sometimes not perceived to be a worthy colleague by their peers or suffered the disapproval of fellow colleagues (Martin).

The problem, according to Glazer-Raymo (1999), was that “men make the rules and women must play by them. . . make no bones about it” (p. 163). The good ol’ boy system was explained as an informal network of communication among departments, institutions and disciplines that were often the source of essential social, political, and intellectual conversations. Women were often not privy to these networks in their institutions. Of the 20 women interviewed by Simeone (1987) on this topic, 18 believed that they had been excluded at some time due to the ol’ boy network. Lawlor (1994) reported on the results of a survey conducted for *Working Woman* in 1994 of 502 executive women and revealed that women believed that the greatest obstacle to their advancement was being a woman in a male-dominated corporate culture (Lawlor, 1994). School administrators also believed that being a woman was a hindrance to their progression as administrators (Funk, 1995).

Women have tended to peak at the middle management level in the educational field and typically had positions with staff rather than line authority (Kaplan & Tinsley, 1989). Women in the higher education field have also been less likely to hold top positions than men. In 1989, only 27% of faculty were female, and female faculty maintained less than 34% of the tenure track positions versus the more than 66% held by men (Pearson, Shavlik, & Touchton, 1989). These figures represented only a 2% improvement in 20 years. Also, 22% of females teaching full-time, as compared to 7% of males, were teaching in non-tenure track positions (Glazer-Raymo, 1999).

Women may have comprised the majority of the educators in the classroom, but the educational executive positions have historically been dominated by men (Glazer, 1991). In 1995, women educators were reported to receive only two-thirds of the pay earned by their male counterparts. These figures continued to be low, despite a growing amount of research that showed the potential of women in all administrative positions (Glazer-Raymo, 1999).

Socially, women have not been considered equal to men in the educational field. Glazer-Raymo (1999) reported the comment of a male dean, ”Golf is the great equalizer, and until women are accepted into the private club environment, I’m afraid they will find it difficult to make it through the glass ceiling” (p. 164). She further elaborated in expressing her belief that women would continue to find it difficult to attain positions of higher leadership as long as men believed that women must be on their social plane to succeed. Similar examples have been cited in the K-12 arena. One principal stated, “I was the only woman principal in my cluster, and it was really difficult for the good ol’ boys to recognize me as an equal. I do believe that women need to exceed. . . in order to be hired over a man” (Funk, 1995, p. 66).

In their study of 2,000 human resource managers, Nelson & Burke (2000) indicated that women experienced considerably more anxiety from organizational politics than did men. This anxiety was attributed to the possibilities that women may have been deprived of access to informal networking situations, may have had difficulty in gaining essential information for their position, and may have lacked power in their departments.

Swiss (1996) surveyed 325 executive women, and found that 68% of these women reported that women had limited opportunity for equal pay. Of those surveyed, 40% did not believe that they were paid the same amount as their male counterparts. In essence, only 17% of the surveyed women said that gender discrimination did not exist in their organization. The factors that were most responsible for inequity in their positions were the ol’ boys’ network, the way of thinking by senior management, and unwritten rules or norms, in the office (Swiss, 1996).

When all higher education faculty members were considered, salaries were higher for men than for women. According to the American Association of University Women, women professors earned 77% of what male professors earned. One reason may have been that women have historically been concentrated in the social sciences and have been paid less than women in the hard sciences, such as math, computer science, and engineering (Wenninger & Conroy, 2001). In fact, over 13% of deans in a statistical sample were women, and more than half of the women were concentrated in the social sciences. There were no women in the hard sciences (Miller, 1993).

In a study by Dagg (1993), it was stated that almost 20% of the women surveyed expressed that they were exploited by universities and colleges because departments offered them less money than they offered to their male colleagues. In a UCLA study, Yao (1999) found that about 25% of male faculty and only 6% of female faculty received over $70,000. Interestingly, women in 1996 made up 47% of the United States citizens with doctorates but only 35% of faculty at universities and only 28% of faculty at research universities.

## Mentoring and Networking

Mentors for females in higher education administration have been noted as being essential. Gruber (2002) said that mentoring relationships usually involve an older professional and a new professional as the protégé. Mentors can counsel women at all levels, give wise insight and smooth the path toward tenure as well as providing support for administrators in new roles. Mentors have been found outside as well as inside a protégé’s department, and more objective information has been attributed to outside mentors. Mentors have had the ability to provide better feedback, introduce protégés to key people and provide insight into beneficial associations. They can also provide advice in terms of future career directions or information on key issues in education. Mentor programs have also benefited institutions. Benefits have included better communications, more competent employees, and a diverse leadership group (Shillingsburg, 1993).

Gruber (2002) made several observations as to why successful professionals were sometimes reluctant to become mentors. First, a protégé’s failure might reflect negatively on the mentor. Second, the participation by the mentor in an exclusively female mentoring relationship may convey an impression of favoritism of women over men in the workplace. Mentoring, however, by older and more professional women, could assist in correcting the imbalance of gender leadership and allow women to become more successful.

In addition to mentoring relationships, networking organizations have also been beneficial to women. One organization that has benefited women in its field has been the Society for Women in Philosophy. This society served as a forum for feminist philosophy by providing the opportunity for publications, moral support, information about the profession, and a network of scholarly colleagues. This type of organization helped women grow in their profession, increased their knowledge of their subject matter, and helped women prepare to survive in the academic world. Martin suggested that all disciplines should create organizations similar to the Society for Women in Philosophy’s structure and interconnect with one another for even more benefit (Martin, 2000).

The Louisiana State University Women’s Studies Council instituted a successful annual event that brought women in the community to campus. These successful women interacted with faculty and students in panel discussions, open discussions, and receptions where issues facing women were addressed (Pearson, Shavlik, & Touchton, 1989).

Martin (2000) also researched a tradition in Sweden that was relevant to informal networking among women. There was a fika (or coffee break) scheduled every morning for faculty at the university. Martin suggested that women faculty create the same concept in the United States. Similar to the overwhelmingly popular concept of men networking on the golf course, academic women could share gender-related troubles, future ideas, and other gender-related topics over coffee and cake.

## Maternity, Child Care, and Family Issues

Women have been discriminated against in higher education for maternity and child care reasons. Having children has made it difficult for women in higher education to receive acceptance. Single mothers especially have had a difficult time in higher education, for the high cost of child care was a cost that was often not considered in salary negotiations (Bengiveno, 1995).

Reasonable lengths of maternity leave have been important concerns for women’s groups on campuses and in communities interested in improving the lives of academic women. HEW guidelines advocated for maternity leaves to be granted to women and parental leave for child rearing for men and women. The EEOC also issued guidelines regarding women’s rights in pregnancy, maternity, and childbirth. The City University of New York was among the first institutions to offer a more flexible option for maternity and child care leave. In 1973, CUNY offered 20 days of paid leave and up to 18 months of unpaid leave for maternity and child care time for all professionals, regardless of gender (Carnegie Commission for Higher Education, 1973). Senior women in administration have reported that commitment to family responsibilities and having children has hindered the advancement of female leaders. However, others believed that being a mother was a leadership lesson in itself in that it fostered communication skills, provided opportunities to teach leadership skills to others as well as to learn to multi-task (Gruber, 2002).

Funk (1995) noted that executive women tended to experience more pressure at home and that less support was given to them than their male colleagues. A major obstacle for women in leadership roles was the fact that they experienced guilt over the time that they spent away from their families. Women also were expected to play the “superwoman” role in their lives. An academic scientist with a family and children said that her research suffered in comparison to those without family obligations. Another noted that faculty husbands of women in academia did not devote as much time to family obligations as did their wives (Martin, 2000). In fact, in a study by Yao (1999), 72% of women believed that having a flexible schedule was an influential job factor in job satisfaction, while only 63% of men thought the same way.

When marriage partners both worked full-time, women experienced a heavier workload when paid work and housework were considered. The typical woman averaged 85 hours a week working, while the average man worked 66 hours per week. This extra time was spent performing work such as housework, home management, and child care (Hochschild, 1989). The extra workload hours tended to interfere with the women's ability to relax, and negative health often was the result (Frankenhaeuser, 1991).

Interestingly, women without children were found to be less productive at work than were those who had children. This finding was based on a multivariate Norwegian analyses of more than 1500 tenured faculty members (199 female and 1370 male respondents). In this study, Kyvik (1990) found that married women were viewed as more productive than single women. Kyvik also found that the age of the children was relevant to productivity. He found that those women with children, under the age of 10, were busier outside of work than those who raised older children. “Thus, only women with small children and unmarried/childless women, who as a group make up about half the women researchers, publish on average substantially less than their male counterparts” (p. 156). Davis and Astin (1987) focused on a study based in the United States, based on a subsample of 299 participants of the 9,948 respondents to a Higher Education Research Institute survey. Davis and Astin found that the women in their sample “produced fewer books, but more chapters, than the typical man and that the two sexes were equally productive in respect to articles” (p. 272).

In 2000, four of five male college presidents were married, while just over half of the female presidents were married. Many women were members of religious orders, however, which prevented them from marriage (Green, 2000). The American Council on Education (2007) stated “Only 63 percent of women presidents are… married, compared with 89 percent of their male colleagues. Twenty-four percent of women presidents are either divorced or were never married (excluding members of religious orders)” (p. 1). A woman provost, interviewed by Glazer-Raymo (1999), believed that women administrators were allowed no personal life, for their lives revolved around the college. Female presidents were also 1% more likely to be divorced than their male counterparts. In 1998, approximately 74% of female presidents had spouses who worked, while less than half of the married male presidents had working wives (Ross & Green, 2000).

## Feminist Theory

Feminist theory was the basis for equality for women. Hooks (2000) stated feminism was “a struggle to end sexist oppression. Therefore, it is necessarily a struggle to eradicate the ideology of domination that permeates Western culture on various levels” (p. 26). Sexist oppression was the oldest form of oppression, for it was the basis of other forms of oppression. Sexism was perpetuated by social norms, by those who traditionally dominated in society, and by those who were socialized to believe in the status quo. Hooks emphasized that women needed to work together rather than struggle against each other to fight sexist oppression. Hooks further stated that feminism was not created for women to become more privileged than men or as a declaration of war against men. Feminism was a change that needed support from both women and men.

Similar to leadership style research, cognitive development has focused on men. Gilligan (1982) suggested that men and women should be studied separately for a holistic analysis of how humans develop cognitively. Gilligan stated that Freud, Erickson, Piaget, and Kohlberg focused their developmental theories on men, thus biasing their tools and analysis methods against women. When women and men were tested by Kohlberg’s tests, for example, women tended to be recognized as less developed. In reaction, Gilligan created a new set of moral development stages to emphasize that women were not inferior to men in moral development, just different. She postulated that women developed in three stages: preconventional, conventional, and postconventional. However, instead of progressing into stages by a change in cognitive development, as suggested by previous researchers, she explained that women progressed by changes in how they viewed themselves. According to Gilligan’s research on participants contemplating abortion, women tended to base moral decision making on their feelings of compassion. She believed that men tended to base their decisions on rights, as defined by law. Hence, she concluded women and men developed by different means.

Several researchers disagreed with Gilligan’s findings. Tavris (1992) stated that “The popularity of this theory does not rest on its scientific merit. On the contrary, research in recent years casts considerable doubt on the notion that men and women differ appreciably in their moral reasoning” (p. 83). Tavris also believed that Gilligan should have studied the reactions of men regarding abortions performed on their partners in order to have gained insight on men and women in their development. Colby and Damon (1987) also criticized Gilligan’s work. They stated that Gilligan’s research did not support a generalized distinction between men and women. Sommers (2000) critiqued Gilligan further and stated, “Without comparative observations of boys, Gilligan’s findings cannot be assessed, indeed cannot be taken seriously” (p. 104).

## Gender Harassment

Associated with sexual harassment, gender harassment is another form of inequality based on gender. Gender harassment is not necessarily sexual in nature, however. Women have faced the brunt of gender discrimination in education, as well as in other arenas.

Judith Rodin, the first woman president of the University of Pennsylvania, proved that a woman could obtain such a prestigious role at an Ivy League School. Yet, when the New York Times wrote an article about her new role they focused on the contrast between the “gray-tweed and furrowed-brow world of academia” with Dr. Rodin’s “cover-girl smile and designer clothes,” and her “pert manner and bouncy determination.” The article recognized a president of a university more as a “serious country club tennis player” than a “boardroom predator.” Also mentioned, in the article, was her 20 years at Yale University where she had served as provost (O’Neill, 1994, p. C1).

 Smith College’s president, Ruth Simmons, had a similar review. Rimer (1995) described Simmons as “elegantly dressed in a long, dark-green pleated skirt and matching jacket, with a double strand of pearls and small golf hoop earrings” (p. B8). Buried in the midst of the text, the reader learned of Dr. Simmons’ two degrees from Harvard and her previous positions of dean and vice provost at other schools. References to dress and physical attributes rather than administrative leadership did not define them as leaders but rather focused on their physical and feminine qualities alone (Glazer-Raymo, 1999). Females have been more likely to receive compliments on their attractiveness and their skill in home management, while men have been more likely to be praised for their intellect. Yet, when female administrators’ appearance and dress were not attractive, they were downgraded personally or they were thought to have sloppy work as well (Sandler, 1986).

## Sexual Harassment

When women first began joining the workforce, they were almost totally dependent on their male supervisors for job security. Hence, when their male supervisors sexually harassed them, they were left with virtually no options but to submit to their advances, quit their job, or try to resist the harassment (Schur, 1983).

Females have encountered more sexual harassment than men in the workplace (Hostile Hallways, 2001). According to Dobash and Dobash (1979), men’s power and control over women were parts of a coercive control system men used to maintain dominance socially over women. Feminist scholars have argued that “domestic violence is rooted in gender and power and represents men’s active attempts to maintain dominance and control over women” (Anderson, 1997, p. 655).

Hogben & Waterman (2000) found a significant correlation between coercive sexual behavior and violence scores on the Conflict Tactic Scale (CTS). Those who were identified as coercers had a higher mean CTS score than non-coercers. Psychological abuse has also been correlated with coercion and abuse. It has been hypothesized that men had violent tendencies because of society’s pressure to act in a masculine manner (Anderson, 1997). Hence, sexual harassment was both “a tool and a result of male domination in society” (Matchen & DeSouza, 2000, p. 303). However, the vast differences between males and females may be explained in different ways as well.

Sexual harassment was defined as “unwanted sexually oriented behavior in a work context” (Riger, 1991, p. 497). Two types of sexual harassment include hostile environments or quid pro quo. Hostile environments include sexual jokes, touching, or displays of items denigrating to women. Harassment was defined as a social problem as opposed to a personal problem for employees. In 1980, sexual harassment was deemed illegal based on Title VII of the Civil Rights Act. Along with this law, employers were given an affirmative duty to prevent sexual harassment, taking all necessary steps to ensure that this occurred. When sexual harassment did occur, employers were then required to impose any and all suitable sanctions, to the offenders of the policy (Schur 1983). Yet, sexual harassment still was prevalent in higher education situations, especially when a woman’s supervisor was a man (Chliwniak, 1997).

In two separate national surveys in the 1980s regarding sexual harassment, approximately 42% of all females surveyed reported that they had experienced sexual harassment in the workplace. A much smaller percentage, less than 10%, indicated they had reported these incidences to their human resource office (Riger, 1991). Victims may have been negligent in officially reporting incidents for two reasons. First, the policies at institutions explaining sexual harassment may have been interpreted to mean something different from what the victim encountered. Second, the conflict resolution procedures that the institution might have adopted may not have been compatible with the way the victim wished to proceed (Riger).

Only female students reported higher levels of harassment than female faculty (Martin, 2000). Men were also reporting sexual harassment but not to the extent that women were reporting incidences. Male complaints included only a small percentage of the overall complaints filed each year (Wasielski & Whatley, 2001). Over time, however, males have reported sexual harassment claims in consistently higher numbers. In 1992, about 9% of the charges were reported by men to the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the state and local Fair Employment Practices Agencies, whereas in 2001, over 13% of all charges were reported by males (U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 2002).

### Sexual Harassment of Non-Caucasian Women

Multicultural women in higher education administration may face not only barriers that other women face but multicultural barriers as well. For example, in the Anita Hill case against Clarence Thomas, the complexity of racism was intertwined with sexual harassment. These two situations combined made the situation even more difficult (Shelton & Chavous, 1999).

 In a study by Shelton & Chavous (1999), women were asked to read two scenarios, one in which a white man was sexually harassing a woman and a second in which a black man was the perpetrator. Overall, both white and black women rated the harasser’s behavior as more humorous and appropriate when the male was black or a co-worker than when he was white or a supervisor. When the same scenario portrayed a white man, rather than a black man, the harassment was seen as more severe. It was hypothesized that black women and black men had a more acceptable and appropriate sexual relationship; hence harassment was not as likely to have been the perception in the scenario. Also, unsolicited sexual behavior between black men and black women was seen as more trivial than that between white women or men. This related to the stereotype that black females had a “code of silence” in reporting black men for illegal acts, and hence ignored their own feelings related to gender in exchange for race. In coping with harassment situations, black women were more likely to confront the harasser, whereas white women were more likely to confide in a friend about the situation. Native American, Caucasian, and Latina females were more likely to report harassment than were African American or Asian American faculty members. Harassment reporting statistics were highest for Native American women followed by Caucasian women (Green, 1996).

### Sexual Harassment of Non-American Men and Women

 In a study comparing Swedish and American men and women, U.S. women reported having had been harassed sexually in the form of physical coercion, nonphysical coercion, or interpersonal violence at a rate three times higher than Swedish women. Accordingly, U.S. men reported using force with a woman at a rate of 16%, compared to 4% of Swedish men. Women in both countries who had more sexual partners increased their risk of encountering an aggressive man sexually. Some men may have viewed sexually experienced women as promiscuous and, therefore, acceptable victims of coercion (Lottes & Weinberg, 1997).

 Lottes & Weinberg (1997) also hypothesized that the more violent nature of men in the U.S. may be due to the higher level of overall violence in the U.S. as compared to Sweden. Perhaps violence in the U.S. was more prevalent, thereby creating more violent men than other nations. Also, sexual education has been less comprehensive in the U.S. than in Sweden. Consequently, sexual ethics were not taught at a young age. U.S. women were also seen as supporters of the double standard and less egalitarian than Swedish women.

### Sexual Harassment Court Decisions

In 1972, Title IX of the Civil Right Act was passed. Title IX prohibited institutions that receive federal funding from discriminating on the basis of sex in educational programs or activities. Because almost all schools receive federal funds, Title IX applied to almost every school (U.S. Department of Education, 1997). This legislation and key court cases have helped to reduce, if not eliminate sexual harassment in schools. In Franklin v. Gwinnett County Public Schools (1992), the Supreme Court held that a student could claim for damages, under Title IX, if a teacher created a sexually hostile school atmosphere. The U. S. Supreme Court ruled in Davis v. Monroe County Board of Education (1999) that students could claim damages under Title IX if students sexually harassed each other. Both rulings indicated that schools were responsible for initiating a prevention program for sexual harassment in the schools and to make sure that situations were dealt with appropriately if harassment occurred (National Coalition for Women, 2002).

Schools have had a lot of responsibility in ensuring that sexual harassment situations have been handled in the correct manner. This has created considerable pressure on school districts. In the Gebser v. Lago Vista Independent School District (1998) decision, it was determined that school districts were not responsible for sexual harassment charges unless an administrator knew about the harassment while it was taking place and did not report the teacher to the proper officials. Before Gebser*,* many courts could have held school districts themselves liable for incidents of sexual harassment by a teacher without knowing if the administration was knowledgeable of the harassment (National Coalition for Women, 2002). After this ruling, it was decided in the Davis v. Monroe County Board of Education (1999) case that the same rule would be applicable to student on student harassment. Title VII protected employees from employers’ sexual harassment and had higher standards by which to abide than Title IX. Apparently, since students were required to attend school, as opposed to voluntarily attending, they received fewer protections from the law (National Coalition for Women, 2002).

### Sexual Harassment in K-12 Schools

In a study by the American Association of University Women (AAUW) Educational Foundation, students in grades 8-11 were surveyed regarding their sexual harassment history in school. Over 80% of students indicated having experienced some form of sexual harassment with females having experienced harassment at a higher level (83%) than males (79%). Over 70% of students said they would report harassment by a school official or employee to an adult, but only 40% of students said that they would report harassment charges to an adult at school if they were harassed by another student. They indicated they would most likely tell friends about the incident. For those who experienced sexual harassment, almost half reported being very upset by the incident. Also, they reported that grades, class participation, comfort, and attendance were compromised by harassment (Hostile Hallways, 2001).

Students have been threatened by sexual harassment from elementary to postgraduate years. In 2002, The National Coalition for Women and Girls in Education (NCWGE) developed a Report Card on Gender Equity. Improvement in reducing sexual harassment received the lowest rating (a "D+") in the assessment of nine key areas of education affected by Title IX over 25 years. The 30-year grade was a “C.” This report summarized the progress, or lack thereof, in reducing sexual harassment. It was concluded that "sexual harassment continues to plague our nation’s schools and students--both boys and girls” (p. 43).

Sexual harassment has placed limits on the benefits of the education system and created hindrances to learning. Schools have had a legal responsibility for administrators and teachers to respond to sexual harassment in the schools. Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act prohibited discrimination in education. In fact department chairs have had “no choice but to take immediate and corrective action at the first instance of reports of sexual harassment” (Cnudde & Nesvold, 1985, p. 782). However, sexual harassment has not been eliminated in America’s schools and has in fact been a detractor to the equal opportunity females have struggled for in the school system. Women who have been harassed have reported a higher level of stress and indicated that they have considered leaving academe more often than women who have not been harassed. Women who have been harassed, according to Green (1996) “may feel trapped at a school, working with colleagues they don’t respect or enjoy” (p. 229).

### Sexual Harassment of Faculty

Institutions that documented anti-harassment policies tended to focus on education regarding the inappropriateness of the sexual harassment act instead of prevention. These institutions also tended to be more concerned with educating employees regarding their policies as opposed to addressing how employees responded to the harassment acts (Wasielski & Whatley, 2001).

Institutions with more women faculty were less likely to have reported harassment incidents. However, women were more likely to have been harassed at public than at private schools, and Caucasian women were more likely to have been harassed than other ethnic groups. Dey, Korn & Sax (1996) studied data collected in 1992-1993 from approximately 30,000 full-time faculty members, representing 289 schools, in partnership with the UCLA Higher Education Research Institute. They reported that 15.1% of female faculty survey admitted to being harassed. In a 1995-96 update, this number dropped to 12%. This updated survey data indicated, however, that more than 26% of women’s studies professors were harassed. Dey, Korn & Sax offered an explanation for this discrepancy. They indicated that this population may have reported a higher percentage because they were more aware of the sexual harassment definition or they worked in areas where harassment was more prevalent.

Surprisingly, in a study conducted by Matchen & DeSouza (2000), 63% of the 359 surveyed college students admitted to engaging in at least one sexual harassing behavior toward a faculty member. All students were undergraduate students in a large Midwest university. Of the 102 faculty members surveyed from the same institution, 53% reported being sexually harassed by students with female professors reporting more unwanted sexual behavior from students. These female professors were also more distressed about the behavior than their male counterparts.

In a later study (DeSouza & Fansler, 2003), over half of the 209 surveyed faculty members at a large Midwestern university indicated having experienced sexual harassment by students at least one time in the prior two years. Results showed that younger female faculty members were at the greatest risk of harassment and the most vulnerable. Female educators were more bothered than men by harassment overall and gender harassment, and their anxiety and depression score ratings were also higher than males who had experienced sexual harassment. The psychological consequences of the harassment were more serious for women than men. As a form of dealing with the struggle of being harassed, internal and external coping procedures were seen among those surveyed. Women used both internal (denial, detachment) and external (seeking help from social systems, relief from the institution) methods. Men, on the other hand, focused more on the external coping system and tended to avoid internal coping methods.

### Reporting Sexual Harassment

During grievance procedures, gender bias has been known to exist. Riger (1991) reported that female educators were especially harmed by sexual harassment, where the “goal of the organization [was] to nurture and promote development” (p. 500). Violations of this nurturing environment could have left deep wounds for the women involved in sexual harassment. This female population may have also preferred informal, rather than formal, grievance procedures for fear that retaliation may result from public announcements regarding the charges. Also, all public institutions that received Title IX funds needed to maintain grievance procedures to handle sexual harassment violations. Thus, the institutions in education were better equipped and more public in dealing with their litigation proceedings. Female educators may have also been reluctant to report incidents, for verbal warnings were often the only punishment inflicted on the offenders (Riger).

Motivation was also a key barrier to why more women did not report sexual harassment charges. Societal role pressures to conform to the traditional sex roles and humiliation, which many women faced in the grievance procedures, further inhibited this decision. Marvel (1998) summarized the importance of reporting incidences, indicating that until more women were able to confront their fears of reporting incidences, they would be discriminated against in the sexual harassment area in education.

### Sexual Coercion and Harassment of College Students

 Sexual harassment has been seen in both secondary and post secondary institutions; however, most research on sexual coercion, or “quid pro quo sexual harassment” (Matchen & DeSouza, 2000, p. 302) has been conducted in higher education settings. Sexual coercion, according to Spitzberg & Rhea (1999), “represents the continuum of processes by which persons are induced into sexual activity against their will” (p. 3). Sexual coercion has been defined as “a more severe form of sexual harassment” (DeSouza & Fansler, 2003, p. 540). At the opposite end of the continuum are less coercive measures which have been noted as psychological pressure.

 Fisher, Cullen, & Turner (2000) reported that many college students had harassing comments made about them, were sexually coerced, received obscene phone calls, or were stalked. Another form of coercion that has become prevalent is obsessive relational intrusion (ORI). “ORI is a form of ongoing and unwanted pursuit of a relationship. It involves activities ranging from constant calling or requesting a date to breaking and entering and surreptitious observation. When such obsessive relational intrusion becomes threatening, it constitutes stalking” (Spitzberg & Rhea, 1999, p. 3).

There have been several types of stalking harassments. One form that has increased with technological advances has been cyberstalking. Cyberstalking has been difficult to address in that cases have typically been referred to local law enforcement agencies, because the behavior did not break federal law. In the New York City Police Department, 40% of technology cases involved electronic threats and harassment between 1997-2001. With the growing number of college students and computer usage, the instances of electronic threats and harassment at the college level have increased. In a 1997 telephone survey study of 4,446 women enrolled at two- and four-year institutions nationwide, 596 or (13.1%) stated that they were stalked. This population cited a total of 696 total stalking incidents. Out of the 696 incidents, 166 (23.9%) included stalking using email (Fisher, Cullen & Turner, 2002).

### Title IX

“Despite the attention paid to the issue in recent years, sexual harassment remains widespread, hurting girls and boys at every level of their education” (National Coalition, 2002, p. 44). Unfortunately, younger victims of sexual harassment were less likely than older victims to know that they were harassed and label their experiences as harassment (Cummings & Armenta, 2002).

Sexual harassment is unwarranted and unwelcome in any environment. This is especially true in schools. Unsolicited sexual words, gestures, pictures, notes, or physical behaviors can interrupt learning at school and the ability to concentrate for students. Acts of harassment were deemed to violate Title VII and IX of the Civil Rights Act which provided the right for individuals to be in school or the workplace and to not encounter sexual harassment. Some forms of harassment in the schools may have included jokes, flashing, mooning, indicating that someone is homosexual, name calling, sexual notes or email, pornographic material, unwarranted sexual comment regarding body parts, spreading sexual rumors, pressure for intercourse or dates, pressure for personal sexual information, repeated phone calls, groping, grabbing, backing into a corner, and gesturing (Hostile Hallways, 2001).

## Career Paths

Female administrators who have progressed to top positions in higher education have most frequently had similar professional career paths. Walton (1996) stated that women were usually faculty members, department chairs, academic deans or vice presidents, and then presidents. The National President’s Study by Ross & Green (2000) focused on college and university presidents nationwide who were leaders of regionally accredited, degree-granting schools. During the winter of 1998 over 3000 presidents were mailed questionnaires and 2,380 presidents were represented in the study. Women tended to earn their highest degree in the humanities/fine arts area and to have a Ph.D. as their highest degree as opposed to having earned an Ed.D. or J.D. degree. Approximately 25% of women presidents had served as vice presidents for academic affairs in their previous positions, and 72% had served at different institutions prior to their presidential appointment. Over one third of women presidents had followed a career path in which they served 10 or more years as full time faculty. Women were also more likely than men to have served on external advisory boards (Ross & Green, 2000).

Cejda and McKenney (2001) surveyed 369 respondents in a national survey of Chief Academic Officers (CAO) in public comprehensive community colleges in an effort to study the career paths of women in higher education administration. They reported the following:

The analysis provided evidence that the most important factor that significantly predicts the career path of CAOs in community colleges was the immediate previous position. The second most important factor affecting the career paths was the career entry port. Third and finally, the remaining significant predictor was the number of higher education positions in the career sequence. As the most significant predictor of career path, a distribution frequency for the first prior position was created…The most common prior position was that of a Primary Academic Officer (32.6%), followed by serving as the Chief Academic Officer at another institution (25.5%)…It would appear that for women a variety of credentials and experiences have become the medium of exchange. Classroom experiences, obtaining a Ph.D., and holding an administrative appointment as a primary or chief academic officer are part of this value system. (p. 1)

The American Council on Education Report, An Agenda for Excellence: Creating Flexibility in Tenure-Track Faculty Careers (2007) reported that “faculty with unusual caregiving responsibilities (e.g., multiple births, a dependent with a physical or mental disability, or terminally ill dependents) are often forced to choose non–tenure-track career paths to manage work and life demands better” (p. iii).

## Barriers for Multicultural, Lesbian and Catholic Women

Minority women in higher education administration may encounter multicultural barriers in addition to the barriers that all women face. According to Chemers (1997), minority leaders have had a more difficult time being promoted than non-minority leaders. However, “there is little indication that minority leaders differ dramatically from dominant culture leaders in behavior, performance, or subordinate satisfaction ” (p. 150). Multicultural women have constituted a small portion within the female minority in higher education administration. McCoy & DiGeorgio-Lutz (1999) stated that “a diverse faculty and administration are critically important if the curriculum and other features of the university are to be transformed” (p. 139). In 1999, men comprised approximately 68% of all U.S. faculty, and 59% were white. Of the approximate 33% of female faculty, 28% were white. In fact, multicultural faculty comprised approximately 11% of all faculty, and females in that category consisted of less than 5%. “To be effective, movement toward the creation of a woman-centered university must also include changes in the campus climate. . . that make up campus life as perceived by the diverse members of the university community” (McCoy & DiGeorgio-Lutz, 1999, p. 139).

There have been specific pressures that ethnic minorities have faced which in turn have had an effect on their performance as educators and administrators. Feelings of isolation, coping strains with stereotyping, discrimination, and pressures from institutional culture were noted by Walker (1993), and all of these pressures were considered stressors.

Isolation was a notable stressor in the lives of black women administrators and may have been a reason that networking became important. A sense of separateness was experienced when black administrators had few or no black staff members or colleagues on whom to rely for needed support. Walker (1993) discussed the emotional support gained by Black women from women who shared similar situations. This sharing also gave women an opportunity to pool resources and ideas.

Other challenges included tokenism. Women who have faced tokenism have been made aware of the fact that they were the only minority women in their positions but have been under pressure to behave as though that difference was not a factor. Others also questioned competency in regard to these women. Mentoring challenges have also been prevalent. Since the number of minority women in higher position leadership roles has been low, there has been a scarcity of mentors to meet the needs of women in lower positions. African American women, however, have exhibited internal and external motivations to succeed in their respective leadership positions. Edwards (1998) stressed the care exhibited by African American women for their community and the extent to which they worked for the welfare of others. They have strived to leave a legacy for future women in their roles. Lastly, they have been inspired to work and to prove their competence to their male and white colleagues.

Hispanic women have also encountered barriers. Cecilia Burciarga, Assistant Dean at Stanford University, described these barriers as the adobe ceiling. This ceiling is not transparent, is thick and dense, does not crumble, and was constructed to last for years. Hansen (1999) indicated that Latina leaders preferred a participatory leadership style, while most administrations were led under a directive style.

Women leaders were not common in the Mexico higher education system in the late 1900s. In 1989, the largest campus in Mexico, Universidad Autonoma Metropolitana-Azcapotzalco, with 16,000 students, hired their first female chief administrator. Mexico higher education institutions had never hired a woman in a rectoral position before, in the history of the country (Green, 1997).

Native American female leaders have not faced as many obstacles as other multicultural groups. In 1996, women led 32% of American Indian Higher Education Consortium member colleges. Janine Pretty on Top stated that since the culture of American Indians was matriarchal and matrilineal, women leaders were not likely to have received the same criticism as non-tribal women (Krumm, 1998).

Lesbian women in higher education administration have had deeply sensitive issues to face in their leadership positions. Because of these issues, lesbians in these positions have been less likely to be open in regard to their sexual identity. Openly lesbian leaders have faced comments, stereotypes, curiosity and discomfort in their positions. Some believed that they were able to be better professionals if their sexual identity was kept confidential. Those who did choose to express their sexual identity did so for various reasons. Women who “came out” during the civil rights movement did so largely for political reasons. Others came out to counter stereotypes of lesbian and gay individuals. Some did so to make the college campus safer for gay students. Additional reasons included the opportunity to claim domestic partners on insurance. Lastly, some women wanted to be honest with themselves and their society by being open about their sexuality (Cook, 1998).

Cook (1998) stated that feminism has, in a sense, been in conflict with the Catholic tradition. This has made it more difficult for female Catholic leaders to lead effectively. Women leaders at schools founded by women’s religious orders, however, have been granted a great deal of support, for they have been in positions to include women in leadership positions. Women working in schools founded by male orders have encountered a “stained glass ceiling.” They have not received the same support as that found in female religious orders due to patriarchal traditions. Catholic women have been encouraged to let their voices be heard, create women’s centers and programs, and serve as role models for students. Interestingly, more women have been successful in being hired by Catholic colleges, primarily because of scarcer funds to hire top male candidates (Cook).

## Summary

 Females in higher education administration have increased in numbers and status on college and university campuses since the 1970s, largely due to affirmative action laws, among other federal regulations and guidelines. Yet, the overpopulation of males in higher administration positions has continued. According to Angel & Barrerra (1991), long-term strategies including official mentoring programs for females at institutions may help women reach their full potential in employment. This is especially true for new employees. Deans have also been encouraged to be cognizant of the gender diversity of their faculty members and strive to increase the number of females they have on staff. Widespread advertising of available jobs and adherence to affirmative action policies, where applicable, have been advocated to improve the recruitment of qualified women.

 Women have been encouraged not to defer to others when they have input, master the art of public speaking, pick their battles, establish personal and professional networks and participate in them, achieve balance in their lives, play to their strengths, and be faithful to their values (Wenninger, 1999). Acquiring experience by observing other administrators, chairing a department or committee, serving an internship, attending leadership institutes, and studying leadership publications has also been advocated as important (O’Donnell, 1996).

 A number of authors addressed the importance of support for women at the institutional level. Wenninger (1994) advocated for the elimination of bias in relation to male colleagues in reference to tenure, promotional advancement, and employment opportunities. Various researchers and writers have made specific recommendations for institutions such as changing policies to improve reporting of sexual harassment, focusing on education and on response procedures to harassment acts (Wasielski & Whatley, 2001). Administrators have been encouraged to develop a comprehensive definition of sexual harassment, a policy statement stating that sexual harassment will not be permitted, and punishments for harassment acts so that all are knowledgeable of the outcomes. These actions have been viewed as ensuring fairness and knowledge that harassers will not go unpunished (Cummings & Armenta, 2002; Green, 1996). In general, researchers have taken the position that institutions and supervisors need to be more aware that females at the higher levels of administration may encounter more barriers, and be subjected to more discrimination than their male counterparts.
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