# CHAPTER : II

# REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

# CHAPTER: II

## REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

### 2. INTRODUCTION

The primary purpose of this study was to explore the process followed by Women Educational Administrators in Higher education system of India to reach to top position and the barriers they face in their journey to administration and the strategies they employ to cope with the resulting conflicts. To ground this study, the researcher explored literature on these areas concerning women administrators in higher education. It is observed that a lot of studies are conducted on women administrators in school education but women administrators in higher education has been neglected as very few studies are found in this area. Here in this chapter only the studies on women administrators in Higher Education are reviewed. The present chapter has been categorized into two categories; (a) career paths and (b) barriers and strategies. The researcher has combined Barriers and Strategies as they are interlinked. It is important to understand the barriers as well as the strategies that women administrators employed to overcome those barriers to attain and sustain administrative positions. The studies reviewed under both headings are presented as follows.

### 2.1 CAREER PATHS

The literature that examines the career paths of women in higher education administration tends to examine the common components which exists in career path; the entry level, from where the individual begins the career, the various positions which one attains during the career and the attainment of the final top most position in the ladder.

In the study conducted by Madsen, S (2007) on 10 Women Administrators. None of the ten women presidents had an official career path to become a University President. One claimed, "I did not plan to go into administration. It just happened".

Most stated that they began thinking about becoming a President when they were Vice Presidents. One stated, "I did not think about becoming a President until after I became a Provost. I did not think about becoming a Provost until I was far into a Deanship. Eventually I thought, 'I could do that!". One President mentioned, "The best positions I have had, I've actually not sought out." Three stated that they seemed *to fall into* new and more challenging positions. A major finding of this research is the value of informal or non-linear career paths for women. This research supports findings from other researchers (e.g., Kreps, 1974; Freeman, 1977; Moore and Sagaria, 1981; Murrel & Donohue, 1982; Ironside, 1983; Fennema and Ayer, 1984; Evans, 1985; Hill & Ragland, 1995; Hartman, 1999; Bolt, 2001; Orman, 2002; Waring, 2003; Vinnicombe & Singh, 2003; Storey, 2005; Steinke 2006; Whitaker, J 2006; Williams, M 2007) that successful women leaders did not intentionally look for leadership positions, but instead worked hard in their current jobs and performed to the best of their abilities. Steinke, (2006) examined the experiences, challenges and transitions of eight College and University Presidents who were the first women senior executives at their respective institutions and reported that "most of the participants in the study did not plan to become Presidents. Usually the role emerged as a possibility later in their career, while priorities such as being with their families, remaining professionally challenged and serving others shaped their career directions". Even the Women Directors in the study conducted by Storey, (2005) and study conducted on Deans by Orman, (2002) reported that 'No participants had planned to become directors or Deans when they entered education; they chose to apply for Directorships or Deanship when opportunities appeared'. Ironside (1983) points to college teaching as a common starting point, followed by the pursuit of the Doctorate, then attainments of administrative experience, as career path choice for women. Moore and Sagaria (1981) found in their study sample that "no single career ladder predominates, and that no single position such as Department Chairperson is likely to be a better launch pad to top positions". However, faculty experience continues to be a prerequisite for most academic positions. Moore and Sagaria (1981) also reports that the women already in major academic positions have generally conformed to the traditional academic model of career advancement. Most have been faculty members, although few have actually headed a Department. Fennema and Ayer (1984) reports, "Most positions related to academic affairs, however, are held by academicians who are senior professors with established credentials. The route to

such positions remains progress through professional ranks". Warner and DeFleur (1993) go further in their emphasis on faculty experience, and point to the Department Chairperson as a major stepping stone to administrations: "Some faculty are chosen by their colleagues to serve as the Department Chair which is often regarded as the basic foundation for those who want to move into other administrative posts." Warner, et al (1988) found that for both men and women, those with faculty experience are significantly more likely to hold administrative positions at Universities (55 percent) than those without faculty experience (38 percent). "Those who have had faculty experience are much likely to be in the highest level of administrations as well as in academic Dean Positions". One might presume that a path can be planned out before it is flowed, and given that the apparent requisites for a successful career in higher education administration – terminal degree, faculty experience, ascendancy into Chair/Dean/Provost/Vice President/President positions – are fairly obvious, one might presume women have developed appropriate career strategies. However, the research reports that while a career is important to many women, their focus on its evolution is lacking. Hojgaard (2002) found that women achieved their leadership positions via professional and middle management jobs. Hill and Ragland (1995) declare: "Because, historically, women often exercised little control over their career paths, they did little planning and goal setting. Pregnancy or a spouse's job transfer could eliminate any career path, so it became less painful to not plan. Kreps (1974) states, "The inability of women to pursue careers as systematically as men because of uncertainties and interruptions leads them to settle for much less career preparation than men". Ironside (1983) found that the women administrators she interviewed did participate in a form of career strategizing, albeit perhaps a different strategizing than men might conduct: "Whether they were aware of it or not, all of the subjects had found ways to further their own goals and enhance their career. Thus, they prepared themselves appropriately, they created their own support systems, they learned how to position themselves for opportunity, and how to interpret and connect their experiences, even when not aware of future possibilities. In other words, they became expert at career strategies which they used to bridge the gap between their own initiatives and motivations, and the initiatives and opportunities made available to them by others. What is suggested is that these high-level careers were more the outcome of personal goals then they were of career planning and precise patterns of preparation". Paul, Sweet and Brigham (1980) have also suggested

that there could be a common career path for men and women to follow on the way to a position of authority in higher education administration especially academic administration. This path is generally described as beginning with the faculty position, moving into administrative position and then ascending up the administrative ladder by securing administrative positions of increasing responsibility. But it is observed that women do not necessarily follow this path due to various reasons. Often, barriers are cited which are presumed to prevent women from taking this course. Evans (1985) reports from her qualitative study, "No one career pattern could be identified" among the sample of women. Touchton, Shavlik and Davis (1993) comprehensive study on women in Presidencies finds that only four percent of the women had "always had a goal;' of being a College President, and for half of these women, this goal evolved as they climbed their career ladders. Only 18 percent had applied directly for their Presidency positions, as opposed to being nominated for, or contacted about the position. Evans (1985) found, on the other hand, that her subjects did not exhibit the same degree of planning. While career played important role in the lives of the women interviewed, "the decision to enter Higher Education administration was generally not well thought out". Evans notes: "Few women actively made decisions to enter Higher Education administration; many were offered positions or entered the field because they could think of no other alternatives. They had no clear dream and only general goals for career advancement. Perhaps the failure of women to achieve top level positions is partially attributable to this lack of planning".

The literature also cites other factors which has an impact on career paths of women administrators. Paul, Sweet and Brigham (1980) talks of manipulable and non-manipulable variables which affects women's career paths. Educational background and longetivity in position are quoted as manipulable factors, Sibling order and mother's education which have been found to influence a female's career mobility, are described as non-manipulable variables. To answer the question of how some of the women administrators achieved the top most position in higher education, Murrell and Donohue (1982) studied the career paths of 44 four-year public university senior leaders and found that women's chances for becoming senior-level administrators were enhanced by doctoral degrees, mid-level administrative experience, and visibility among Presidents. More than half of the women Vice-Presidents in their

study were invited to occupy the position by their Presidents. This last strategy of becoming highly visible was also emphasized as the most important and effective strategy by half of the women CAOs studied by Walton and McDade (2001) as well as by the 32 women Presidents involved in Touchton, Shavlik, and Davis' (1991) research. These researchers found that after some of the women leaders became interested in seeking a Presidency, they started to position themselves by increasing their professional visibility, enhancing their strengths, and working on their deficiencies. In fact, successful women leaders quickly recognize the importance of increasing their professional visibility both within and outside their institutions. One common strategy used by the 20 women Presidents and vice presidents in public four-year institutions in Elder's (1986) study, for instance, was participation in professional associations for senior women leaders. Half of these women leaders belonged to four or more professional associations while 30% of them belonged to two or three professional organizations. More than half of them recognized such activities as essential to their administrative effectiveness. The 32 women CEOs in Touchton, Shavlik, and Davis' (1991) study also believed that experience as board members for educational, governmental, corporate, or non-profit organizations was the most helpful professional activity that led to their advancement to the Presidency. More than half of the 32 women Presidents served on four to six or more institutional boards before assuming their present position as CEO. Active involvement in professional development programs was another common strategy used by women leaders. The 14 women Presidents and Vice-Presidents in Anglis' (1990) study, for instance, believed that involvement in leadership development programs sponsored by well-known professional associations enhanced their career mobility. The two most helpful professional organizations identified by women Presidents in Thouchton, Shavlik, and Davis' (1991) study were ACE and Harvard's Institute for Educational Management. The same research finding was echoed by Walton and McDade (2001), Brown (2000), and Rosynsky (2002). More than half of the women Provosts in Walton and McDade's (2001) study had participated in professional development programs sponsored by these two prestigious organizations, and these women CAOs believed that such experiences led to their advancement to their current positions. Women Presidents in Brown's (2000) and Rosynsky's (2002) dissertation studies also benefited from national education programs sponsored by well-known professional organizations such as ACE. As scholars (Chamberlain, 2001; Laden, 1996; Weisman,

2002) reflected on the progression of academic and administrative leaders in higher education, they recognized the important contributions made by professional associations and women's organizations as well. Although some women presidents and vice presidents reported getting their positions because they happened to be ready when a vacancy occurred (Anglis, 1990; Murphy, 1991; Rosynsky, 2002; Walton & McDade, 2001), simply doing a great job and waiting for others' recognition did not help women much in terms of advancement. Harrow (1993) and Tinsley (1984) warned that hard work, exceptional academic and administrative achievements, and dedication were not enough for women in academe to obtain promotions or to secure their jobs. As a result, they stressed the importance of career mapping. To help women develop their career plans strategically, Harrow (1993) proposed a three-phased strategic career plan that included most of the previously identified strategies.

Phase 1 of Harrow's (1993) plan involved building skills, abilities, credibility, and a relationship with one's boss and colleagues while gaining access to essential information, analyzing the political climate, identifying sources as well as uses of power, and being aware of office politics. Phase 2 emphasized identifying individual and institutional support systems, building coalitions as well as alliances, and seeking powerful mentors to build a strong web of support. Phase 3, the final stage, entailed marketing activities such as increasing visibility; building a positive public persona; acting like a winner; continued practice and reflection on a wide range of leadership skills; and remaining competent as well as current in one's professional field, human relations, and important issues on campus.

The topic of career paths has been an ongoing topic of discussion and research. Literature is found which reports studies of women who generally had linear career paths as they rose through the ranks to become leaders (e.g., White, 2003). Walton (1996) found that the career paths of the women were traditional steps up the academic ladder. Yet, most of the literature reviewed has reported that women leaders had informal or nonlinear paths. Women in these samples did not intentionally look for leadership positions and were sometimes even reluctant. Hartman (1999) concluded that there was no single formula or path for leadership. Every woman took a different path. This supports the notion that various career paths can lead to top

leadership positions in academe. Some researchers argue that women should decide early and plan more direct career paths toward their intended leadership goals. However, it is clear that these women became the leaders they are today because of every differing career and life opportunity. In fact, the richness of their current perspectives and insights can be attributed to this variety of career and service choices and opportunities.

## 2.2 BARRIERS AND STRATEGIES

The lack of women in administrative positions has been explained in the literature by identifying the barriers which hinders in their career progression. Barrier is defined as a factor, event or phenomenon that prevents or controls access to individuals from making progress. Barriers may be tangible or intangible, actual or perceived by the recipient (Maskell-Pretz and Holpkins, 1997).

Women face a number of barriers to their progress in organizations, and to the gaining of power. Throughout the literature on women in Higher Education administration, a variety of barriers are uncovered that impact the career development of female administrators. The various barriers are reported in the literature. Socio cultural stereotypes are found to be major barrier in the career progression. This includes Balancing career and family (Boyum, B 2006, Black G, 2002, Wilking K, 2001, Kreps 1974) , lack of family support system (Moody, B 2004, Katundano T 2005, Willbanks J 2005, Long, J, 2008, Willis, R 2004, Scott, T 2005, Wilbanks, J 2005, Groch, E 2005, Marshall, S 2002, Moore, R 2003), Marital Responsibilities (Bolt, M 2001), Role conflict between career & family (Edwards, N 2002), Personal balance between family and career (Wootton, P 2006), major family responsibilities like demands of motherhood, marriage and the extended family (Chitiga, M 2001). The traditional division of labor leads people to expect domestic responsibilities to be women's primary roles and any obligation that detracts from their ability to perform their primary role causes role conflict (Charles and Davis 2000). Marriage status and child rearing are factors frequently associated with limitations in a woman administrator's career development. The role of wife may conflict with role of administrator where career mobility is concerned. This has been reported frequently in many of the studies (Cahalan, 2007; Sipple, 2007, Groch, 2005; Willbanks, 2005;

Seipke, 2006; Wooton, 2006 and Warner, 1988. Women are expected to shoulder a majority of responsibilities at home and the overall welfare of the family takes precedence over personal interests and desires (Varghese, 1990; Singh, 1992, and Grewal, 2002). Though it is generally accepted for women to work outside the home, it is evident in the study conducted by Freeman, 1992 and Rouse, 1999 that the responsibilities of home bear heavily on women. Newman, 1978 suggested that women frequently have had to compromise their career aspirations because of inner conflict created by family responsibilities and role identification. Women especially married women and those with children; face significant institutional barriers in their struggle to attain administrative positions (Mancini, 1993). This hypothesis that "married women and women with children would be less represented in the presidency" was confirmed by Mancinin, 1993 in the quantitative study conducted to compare and contrast the career paths of male and female College and University Presidents. This led to women avoiding marriages. Chou, 1992 while studying the gender differences in the academic reward system nation wide, of university faculty members reported that women are more likely to remain unmarried.

The women administrators studied by Katundano, 2005 shared that "a series of family and work challenges emerges to limit a woman's opportunities in attaining promotion and even sustaining the present position". Steinke, 2006 also reported in his study on women Presidents that "The professional demands inevitably affected their personal lives & finding a balance between professional & personal responsibility often proved challenging". Women continue to be responsible for the majority of family responsibilities such as care of dependent children (Hochschild, 1997; Wirth, 2001; Singh 1992). The women administrators with children in many of the studies reviewed have reported that stereotypes and perceptions of women with families are barriers to their advancement (Griffith and MacBride-King, 1998; Liff and Ward, 2001; Metz and Tharenou, 2001; Still, 1997). Many other problems are also linked with family responsibilities as Women in today's society have multiple roles, multiple identities, and multiple challenges as married women or life partners, as daughters, as sisters, as mothers, as members of communities, and as women in the work-force, among others. In particular the dual roles of mother and worker can conflict and present challenges for women who want to have both a career and a family. Women working in Higher education are no exception (Brooke, 2007). The uneven burden of

child care and household responsibilities that women shoulder has been a major barrier to their advancement to administrative positions (Edson, 1981; Parkway & Curie, 1992). There is increasing evidence that concerns about work family conflict among women administrators even in the United States (Clark, Caferella, and Ingram, 1999, Grogan 1999; Hall 1996;) and in Great Britian (Haughton, 2002), may be overshadowed by these frequently cited barriers. Although women today can pursue their own careers, they are still expected to put their families first because no matter how good they are in the workplace, home is still "their" primary job (Jones, 1993; Kimmel, 2004; Mark, 1981; Witmer, 1995). For women who want both a career and a family, balancing these two priorities becomes their biggest personal challenge (Bruckner, 1998; Clark & Caffarella, 1999; Hensel, 1991; Jones, 1993; LeBlanc, 1993; Harris, Lowery, & Arnold, 2002; Mark, 1981; O'Laughlin & Bischoff, 2001;Rosynsky, 2002; Thompson & Beauvais, 2000; Villadsen & Tack, 1986; Wilking, 2001; Zakery, 1991).

The barriers related to family responsibilities, were majorly faced by the women administrators due to lack of support systems which is also evident from the literature. Majority of the administrators have reported the lack of support systems (Cahalan, 2007; Cook, 2007; Santee, 2006; Wilbanks, 2005) and those women who could mobilize support systems could sustain administrative positions and were successful. The college Presidents studied by Williams, 2007 attributed their success to strong family background. Katundano, 2005 studied the Associate Deans and found that the immediate family, support & work supports emerged as important factors for personal growth of women, carrier choice & success in her administrative work. Cahlan, 2007 in his study on women educational administrators has reported that the women had strong family support and support from husbands which helped them to sustain administrative positions. They sacrificed time with their families in order to accommodate careers. Husbands in particular have played an important role as influencer for the women administrators. Even the women administrators in the qualitative study conducted by Williams, 2007 attributed their success to strong family background. Many studies reported the importance of family support especially, encouraging husband as important for sustaining administrative positions (Adams, 2006; Cook, 2007; Johnson, 2005; Katudano, 2005; Ashbyscott, 2005; Storey, 2005; Evans, 1985; Atteberry, 1985). Studies have showed that, given the

demands placed upon women leaders, they were more likely to suffer from "mommy guilt," marital instability, role conflicts, health problems, and stress unless they have reliable and quality support systems (Dietz, 1997; Gatteau, 2000; Gerdes, 2003; Harter, 1993; Nelson & Burke, 2000; Rosnsky, 2002; Villadsen & Tack, 1986). Dublon, 1983 found in her study of women higher education administrators "Respondents who were married or who planned to be married cited a supportive husband as the reason marriage would enhance or have no effects on their advancement....Those women who planned on remaining single also viewed their marital status as either enhancing or having no effect on career advancement because of the perceived flexibility which would accompany their status....Less flexibility was seen as a limitation attributed to raising a family. Women who did not expect to have children indicated that their advancement would either be enhanced or would not be affected because of the greater flexibility achieved without children. Strong support system from family has been attributed to success in many other studies also by the women administrators (Sentee, W 2006, Adams, E 2006, Sipple, B 2007 , Johnson 2005, Atteberry, 1985). One of the available studies by Villadsen and Tack (1986) focused on how women executives in public four-year institutions juggled multiple family and career demands. Together they interviewed 20 female executives who had at least one child under 18. These women decision-makers identified seven balancing strategies including "compartmentalization", which required clear boundaries between home and work time. These women leaders made careful arrangements for their family duties and tried not to allow their work to spill over to their family life. "Delegation" and "lowered housekeeping standards" reduced women's burdens at home; these women used all the support structures they could get, including hiring full-time maids to help them meet their families' needs. "Physical and intellectual or artistic escape," "friendships and social contacts," "vacations," "(putting off) publishing," and "continuing education" either helped women cope with the stress or helped them set priorities to make the balancing act possible. After studying 14 women Presidents and Vice Presidents, Anglis, 1990 obtained similar conclusions and emphasized the strategy of time management for combining personal and professional obligations. The four women college presidents interviewed by Rosynsky, 2002 also emphasized the importance of having a very supportive family members, and establishing quality support networks for successful balance between personal and professional lives.

Senior administrative and academic women leaders who participated in Gerdes', 2003 study offered a wide range of advice that can help women overcome individual barriers. Some of their suggestions were "stand up for ourself...develop confidence...do what's good for you...follow your values...be yourself...do what you love...have high aspirations...do your best...and have fun, a sense of humor, and friends".. These women also suggested that women choose their partners carefully, negotiate and establish support networks, and have no or few children. Individual scholars and practitioners also offered general recommendations such as choosing family-friendly environments (Dietz, 1997; Marshall, 2002); securing quality caregivers (Hensel, 1991); obtaining social support from mentors and networks (O'Laughlin & Bischoff, 2001); fostering positive attitudes to increase confidence (Ausejo, 1993); being assertive and speaking up (Dickson, 2000); making part-time arrangements for child care (Schreiber, 1998); and using time effectively, including time for stress relief (Jones, 1993). All in all, findings available from both empirical studies and women's experiences verified the existence of personal obstacles that can impede women's progress in higher education administration.

Women also face another family related barrier which limits in geographical mobility. Women often put their spouse's careers before their own. Thus, they must be unable to accept career advancement opportunities which include a geographical movement. As Kalpan and Helly (1984) state," senior administrators are peripatetic. They must be prepared to move themselves and their families to a new location if they wish to advance professionally. For married women, this need for mobility can have negative effects on husband and family". Moving the whole family only for the sake of the wife's advancement is still less acceptable in society and, thus, becomes a potential obstacle for women's career advancement (Touchton, Shavlik, & Davis, 1991). In Dublon's (1983) study of female higher education administrators, geographical mobility was the limitation cited more frequently.

The mothers of women administrators are also examined in the literature. Epstein, 1970 suggests that professional mothers are positive role models for their daughters, because they support the notion that it is possible to pursue both a career and motherhood, as well as enjoy this work. The expansive study that Twombly and

Moore (1991) undertook to assess the social origins of higher education administrators reports findings which seem to support Epstien's connection. The women respondents consistently came from families "in which mothers were more likely than their male counterparts' mothers to be employed outside the home". They also found that many of these mothers had pursued a level of higher education. Twombly and Moore summarize; "women who become administrators are more likely to come from highly educated, two career families. These findings provide further support for previously stated conclusions that women benefit from family role models." Touchton, Shavlik and Davis (1993) examined women in Presidencies in 1985, and found that 44 percent of all mothers of women Presidents "had worked outside the home at some time when their daughters were in elementary or high school....the mothers of these Presidents seem to have served as early role models for career pursuit and achievement". Freeman, 1977 reports on the profile of top-level women administrators in Washington D.C; and notes also that the typical women administrator encouraged by her parents, and achieved more formal education than either parent.

Stereotyping also contributes to women's lack of progress. The attitudes that differentiate men and women, and lead to differing socialization, develop at a very early stage. Traditional stereotyping starts from the moment of birth because the child is handled differently according to whether the child is a boy or a girl. Childhood socialization and the games children play may have a consequence for women's failure to notice the informal power network, take part in power struggles and create alliances (Henning, 1978). Bower (1993) points to childhood experiences for girls, and in particular their lack of sports participation. Because girls do not participate in team sports as much as boys do, she says, they grow up to be women who are less likely to develop the skills necessary for the mentoring relationship that can be vital to their career development. Williams and Piper's study (1988) of 18 women administrators at upper Mid west Public colleges and Universities offers a slightly different twist to the sports connection: "Although thy perceived that lack of previous opportunities to participate in team sports had not been a significant constraint, nine respondents did state that learning to be competitive was important". Astin, 1984 found that socialization shapes individual work expectations, for example, what kind of jobs are accessible and also other priorities in life, such as the importance of

family. Professional women's socialization to work generally begins with parental expectations that although work and careers are important and highly regarded, they will always be secondary to marriage, husband and children. Freeman, 1977 states that women have the same drives as men for power, authority and status, but they have been socialized differently and must take a "circuitous route" to attaining these goals "because society has taught them that certain aggressive behaviors are not ladylike". Flynn, 1993 speaks also to how a woman is "raised" and how her career therefore develops, "Women are no different from men in needing to prepare themselves and recognize opportunities when they occur. They are different from men in that that they aren't raised to view positions of leadership as possible professional goals". Ramsunder, 2006 qualitatively studies the eight women administrators who were Deans and above Deans. These administrators reported that "Gender proved to be major obstacle for them in getting to their present positions". In the study conducted by Ononiwu, 2001 on women Educational Administrators, the participants were in agreement that there are serious societal stereotypical hindrances that need to be completely removed. While Bower, 1993 cites that stereotyping does not individually or collectively account differences in career development, she does concede that stereotyping can inhibit a women's career development. Kalpan and Helly (1984) also wrote on this topic and state that socialization causes men and women to have "differences in the perceptions of the world.

There are certain institutional barriers which are reported in the literature. This includes sex segregation in occupations, promotions, positions, and earnings.. Konrad and Pfeffer (1991), for instance, used the Duncan segregation indexes to analyze the College and University Personnel Association's 1978 and 1983 annual compensation data. As they examined the hiring patterns, they found that some positions in Colleges and Universities were segregated by gender. To produce gender integration in 1978, 42% of the men and women in higher education administration had to change jobs. Five years later, that percentage dropped slightly to 37%. They also found that women were more likely to be hired for lower-paying and lower-level jobs. Other scholars reported gender stratification of College and University employees as well (Johnsrud, 1991; Johnsrud & Heck, 1994; Kulis, 1997; Moore, 1984; Sagaria, 1988; Tinsley, 1986). After conducting a national study on male and female administrators in four

year institutions, Moore (1984) reported that "Women...seem to be able to build careers in some tracks more easily than in others", that they were more likely to be "pocketed" in certain positions, and that they were less likely to be promoted as principal line administrators. After Tinsley, 1986 reviewed the literature available at that time, she concluded that most women administrators in higher education were still doing "women's work" and that they were "far more likely to be assistants to, assistants, or associates than they were to be Directors, Deans, Vice-Presidents, Provosts, or Presidents". In addition to visible institutional obstacles, women leaders experienced more intangible cultural bias in the workplace. Socio-cultural barriers such as gender stereotypes, negative attitudes about women in leadership positions, or an inhospitable organizational climate are often products of the widely accepted traditional ideas about men, women, and leadership. According to Dietz, 1997, "It is apparent that many of the men in both mid-level and senior management are struggling to accept women as peers on multiple levels of consciousness", and these women "were never wholly part of the group and they were well aware of it". As a result, executive women leaders in Dietz (1997), Rosynsky (2002), Thompson- Stacy (1995), and Zakery's (1991) dissertation studies all stressed the importance of knowing the culture of one's institution and shared some strategies they employed to deal with this critical issue. Except for using all possible and creative mentoring strategies to adapt to the existing culture, they especially emphasized the strategy of taking the initiative to help their male counterparts feel comfortable working with them. Women were advised to learn to relate to men on subjects with which they felt comfortable. Bower states that often men do not consider women to be serious about their careers, largely because women have "society's full approval" to leave their profession at any level. Men therefore are inclined not to mentor women. Even in the selection process we do find gender biasness due to such stereotypical attitudes. Yet Flynn (1993) contends that "Some of the institutions that have the opportunity to recruit women as presidents have a great fear that if they do, the institution will not be taken seriously.....Reasons cited for removing qualified women from the applicant pool included a belief that women cannot effectively fund raise, will not be taken seriously by the higher education community, and cannot administer large institutions or competitive sports programs. Vestiges of sexism still exist on the part of boards of trustees and regents who make decisions about hiring. There is still the belief that women can't raise money. In Jablonski's, 1996 qualitative study, for instance, seven

female College Presidents from the Northeast described the negative impact that the traditional masculine leader image has on female leaders. According to Jablonski, 1996, women Presidents promoted a participatory leadership style to empower others, but male-dominated board members and faculty leaders (including males and females) did not support such a style because they expect strong, assertive, and aggressive traditional leaders. The conflict of women's social and professional roles produced problems for women as well (Sandler, 1986). For instance, the "double bind" refers to the dilemma of having to fulfill the traditional masculine image of serving as a good leader and the image of being a good woman (Curry, 2000; Jones, 1993; Sturnick, 1991; Tedrow & Rhoads, 1998). On the one hand, a female's ability to lead was questioned if she did not follow the male pattern of leadership. On the other hand, her leadership was criticized and resisted if her behaviors contradicted with the traditional model of a nice, good, virtuous woman (Jablonski, 1996; Sandler, 1986; Wajcman, 1998). While male leaders can simply "be themselves" and easily establish their legitimacy, female leaders have to struggle between two incompatible roles and find a way to balance skillfully between them. The six female Vice-Presidents interviewed by Cline, 1996 for instance, expressed their frustration over the fact that they received totally opposite feedback when exerting similar behaviors as their male counterparts. Take assertion, for example. They witnessed men being praised and rewarded for being assertive but had to put up with criticisms for their being "pushy" or "bitchy". Similarly, Kanter, 1993 documented how women were excluded from informal networks after they entered managerial positions, how men in power did not feel comfortable dealing with women, and how existing managers' "homosocial reproduction" can have a negative impact on women. The exclusion of women from the old boys' networks means that women have to find other ways to connect with those in power to obtain the resources and support they need. They often have to take the initiative to help board members feel comfortable working with them as well. According to Johnsrud and Heck (1994), to avoid such institutional barriers, women should actively seek different opportunities to demonstrate a variety of skills. Seeking sponsorship and creation of new positions were two other strategies commonly used by women in Johnsrud's, 1991 study. The 84 senior academic and administrative women leaders recommended avoiding the service trap; learning to say "no;" being aware of negative, hidden attitudes toward women; working hard; and doing one's best as effective individual strategies for combating institutional barriers. In terms of

strategies for avoiding gender bias in hiring practices, Thompson-Stacy (1995) interviewed 20 female executives and concluded with the following five most commonly used strategies: improving one's negotiation skills, benchmarking, improving interpersonal communication skills with male colleagues, networking, and using male as well as female mentors. Fenkins', 1994 keys to negotiation success included "keep things simple, structure your presentation, anticipate objections, build in some sacrifices, don't try to score all the points, meet resistance flexibly, don't give away the store, and rise above politics".

Lack of role model, sponsorship and mentorship has also been frequently reported as one of the barrier in most of the studies. Mentorship alone has also been studied by many researchers but very few are empirically based research reports dealing with higher education. There is a connection between role modeling and mentoring/sponsoring. One who sponsors or mentors another may very well be a role model to that individual. A scarcity of female role models contributed to the limited research in this area. While speaking of the scarcity of female role models, researchers also often support the assertion that role models can be critical to a female administrator's career development. Carlson and Schmuck (1981) states that the scarcity of women role models affects the contingencies of counsel, encouragement, and socialization, at least to the extent that women choose women as sources for these things. Bower, 1993 applies a general statement specifically to women in higher education, "the absence of some role models has an inhibiting effect on the career advancement of women". Johnsrud and Rosser (1999) conclude that women who work with very few other women have lower work place morale. Paul, Sweet and Brigham (1980) state "since there are very few females in top-level administrative positions, there are very few role models for aspiring administrators to emulate", this view is later on supported by Kuhnle, 2007; Wilbanks, 2005; Brown, 2003. Nieboer, 1975 states that perhaps because of scarcity of role models of successful women administrators or the stereotype of the 'career woman' which still exists, most women are not ready to contemplate non-traditional high-level administrative positions in coeducational institutions. These two problems are clearly inter related; without role models, an increase in women administrative applicants seems unlikely; without an increase in applications and appointments, the number of women administrators is not

likely to increase. Lack of mentor has inhibited the progress of women administrators, at the same time the availability of mentor has contributed in the career advancement of women administrators as reported by (Wicker, 2008; Cassandra, 2005; Legget, 2002; Bolt, 2001; Chitiga, 2001). Having a mentor significantly affects individuals' perceptions of power in organizations and women could have acquired more power in those organizations through mentoring (Fagenson, 1990). The women administrators studied by Santee, 2006 shared "mentoring was an additional contributor beyond social support". The 12 women Presidents in the study conducted by Kampel 2006, also reported the influence of role models and mentors and obstacles to success. Mentors are usually found to be higher-level managers who encourage, guide, support and facilitate a junior executive/protege's career advancement (Lahtinen, 1993). They could be a key for women to advance in their careers. Most top female executives have had mentors who were vital to their success. It is suggested that mentoring received by women could lead them to experience less discrimination and speed up women's careers (Vertz, 1985). As to mentoring, all of the six women vice presidents in Cline's (1996) dissertation research reported that having one or more mentors was an important factor in their advancement and their overall success. Mentors can be men, women, colleagues, partners, parents, or supervisors. In Warner and DeFleur's (1993) essay, working with male mentors or sponsors was suggested as one way for women to make themselves known in the "old boy network" so they can advance. Clearly, mentors provide priceless advice on how to fit in the system, how to develop linkages with others, and how to acquire needed resources (Anglis, 1990; Johnsrud, 1991; Rosynsky, 2002; Sandler, Silverberg, & Hall, 1996). When the six women presidents included in Gatteau's (2000) dissertation study reflected on their road to success in their careers, they all talked about how the many male and female heroes, mentors, and role models in their lives had inspired them. Noe, 1988 suggests that mentors are important in helping women to understand the realities of the male-dominated business culture. Mentors are essential for introducing women to the formal network of power relations in the organization (Arnold and Davidosn, 1990). Through mentoring women would have better access to power networks and could receive more promotion. It is reported in studies that employees with mentors have more promotions. However, women experience difficulties in entering the "old boy networks" (Brass, 1985). Kinnersley, 2009 in his study on female administrators suggested that institutions of higher education, professional associations and graduate

programs that prepare women to become administrators should develop methods to prepare a culture of mentoring. Even Steinke, 2006 also concluded that more attention needs to be paid to the mentoring. Germany, 2005 in the study conducted on African American women in educational leadership suggested in the end that a woman in educational leadership needs to be mentored. It was believed by the administrators that more efforts in recruitment would encourage more women to seek higher positions in the realm of education. It revealed that more administrators need to groom potential administrators and allow them to have opportunities to grow. Mentoring has also emerged as one of the important theme in the study by Moody, 2004 in the study conducted on ten African American women administrators. The participants in the qualitative research conducted by Willis, 2004 reported that "Engaging in mentoring relationship helped them bridge the gap between theory & practice". Additionally they stated that more than one mentor, bringing varied perspectives to the mentee was needed to help address job related challenges. The respondents further reported that mentoring relationships are beneficial to both mentor & mentee & emphasized that the mentoring relationships should be open & both the mentor & mentee should be approachable. Mentorship has been reported as a significant factor in a female administrator's career by Leconte, 2006; Ramsunder, 2006; Abbott, 2005; Rosynsky, 2003; Brown, 2003; Leach, 2000; Oakes, 1999; Bower, 1993; Follon,1983. The studies by Evans, 1985, Barrax 1985, Mc. Neer 1983, Hubbard and Robbinson 1994, Hill and Ragland (1995) on women administrators in higher education has reported that majority had mentors at the master's and doctoral levels as well as in their early professional academic careers. Regarding the latter, the majority of the mentors were female, but a higher percentage of females had male mentors during their master's and doctoral programmes. Testimony to the impact of mentoring can also found in an 1994 interview of Dr. Linda Wilson, College President (as reported in Arnold, 1994): "I had a very good high school chemistry teacher who I'm sure is part of what even made it possible for me to go into chemistry; and then four wonderful women chemistry teachers in my undergraduate school who illustrated that you can be woman chemist, a wonderful human being, and splendid teacher. One of them was married and had a family, so the role model was full in that sense."

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

Bower, 1993 and Wilbanks, 2005 presented the "Queen Bee" phenomena as reason for scarcity of female mentors. This theory presumes that there is room for only one outstanding woman in an organization, and therefore other women are expected to fight their way to the top, as the current "Queen Bee" did. Aery, 1977 speaks further to the "Queen Bee Syndrome". The Queen Bee is the woman who has "fought her way up in a man's world" and, in her own self interest, opposes other women succeeding. The implicit reasons for this kind of behaviour may range from not wanting to "rock the boat", to wishing to exclude competition, or to desiring the rewards usually given by the system for being that unique kind of woman who "thinks like a man"... the "Queen Bee" disassociates herself from the fundamental issues of equality for women, while assuring her male colleagues that se is not in sympathy with the feminist movement. Younger women very often view the successful woman administrator as a deliberative, manipulative risk taker and thus do not choose to identify with her as a role model.

Warner and DeFleur (1993) summarized that "Mentoring and sponsorship plays a particularly important role in the advancement of women in higher education administration. Mentors help protégés understand the rules of the game; they give positive support for accomplishments and provide feedback on performance. Mentoring relationships also should include sponsorship so that the careers of protégés can be more carefully directed". It has been suggested in the literature that "mentoring women as junior faculty is a viable option for assisting them to cope up through the pipe line academia" (Kuhnle, 2007; Brown, 2005 Van Ummerson & Sturnick, 2001; Hansman, 1998, Johnson, 1998, Morrison, white & van velsor, 1992, Oakes 1999, warner & DeFleur, 1993).

Lack of networking is also reported as one of the important barriers in the literature (Wilbanks, 2005). The women who could succeed had created a network which helped them (Santee, 2006, Nakama, 2005, Rosynsky, 2003, Sudduth, 2003). The women leaders studied by Nakama, 2005 in their interview agreed that they were benefited from networking strategy. Even the women Directors which were selected for case study by Storey, 2005 supported this view that creation of networking has helped them in their career advancement. Twale, 1995 points to competition for top leadership roles and suggests, "Networking with colleagues at conferences and regional meetings could therefore have a positive effect on women's upward career mobility and professional development". Le Blanc (1993) states that "Networking is a key method for establishing a personal system of support...By establishing and maintaining a strong internal/external support system, a woman becomes more resourceful. The greater her resourcefulness, the greater is her sphere of possible positive influence in higher education". Leconte, 2005 in a study conducted on five women administrators in higher education and reported that "women in higher education who engage in networking stand a better chance of landing a senior administrative job than men who do not". Ausejo, 1993 also speaks about networking that "Networking is an informal support system that can be used by women administrators in the development of a career plan. Men have had this system in place for a long time and recognize the importance of this camaraderie tool. Enterprising "career minded" women will also take advantage of the opportunity to benefit from networking. Recognizing that diversification can lend itself to an enriching balance in her mission to succeed, she will network with both men and women". Hubbard and Robbinson (1994) find that nearly fifty percent of the women administrators they studied stated that "networking helped them to obtain the position they currently held in administration"; and over 96 percent "believe that networking is helpful to individuals and new professionals in reaching career goals". Hubbard, 1993 conducted study on both male and female in higher education administration by using quantitative methodology and reported that majority of females in higher education administration utilized networking to help them obtain their jobs in administration.

Lack of politicking is also being reported as one of the barrier. Most of the top level positions in Higher Educational institutions are political in nature. One has to be well connected if want to aspire of these top level administrative positions. Ropers-

Huilman, 1998 reminded women leaders that power and leadership have multiple forms and strategies. For women to become politically savvy, they must first know what kinds of power they possess and how they can use their influence skillfully and effectively. Similarly, advice offered by senior women leaders interviewed by Clemons, 1998; Cline, 1996 and Thompson-Stacy (1995) was to be knowledgeable about the power bases on which they as well as other major players have relied. To be politically savvy, women leaders must be willing to spend time identifying and analyzing the political situation and plan a strategy to confront their opponents, when necessary. After Bashaw and Nidiffer (2002) examined women administrators' careers in higher education, they found three political strategies women leaders often use to pursue their goals. First, these senior women leaders were observant and formed strong male alliances to remain in power as well as to accomplish their goals. Second, they were highly skilled at fundraising. Last, they were flexible with a repertoire of different strategies that allowed them to maneuver around different roadblocks to, at least, partially fulfill their goals. Other personal sharing on solutions to political obstacles included breaking through the informal information network by establishing one's own networking arenas, being political without losing one's integrity, being healthy and strong enough to bear a great amount of stress, learning to relax and be themselves (Harter, 1993), finding advocates and mentors (Growe & Montgomery, 1999; Guteck, 2001; Lynch, 1990), taking risks (Growe & Montgomery, 1999; Sturnick, 1999), creating individual as well as institutional ties and alliances (Growe & Montgomery, 1999), negotiation and delegation (Lynch, 1990), and enhancing the status as well as legitimacy of women as leaders (Growe & Montgomery, 1999; Yoder, 2001). Since women are socialized to be submissive and powerless, most of them not only view words such as "politics" and "strategies" as dirty but also feel uncomfortable talking about them openly (Albino, 1992; Thompson-Stacy, 1995). Since women have been socialized to be powerless, many of them do not know how to play the political game. However, the fact that higher education is a very political environment with competing interests leaves women leaders with no choice but to learn to be political (Bolman & Deal, 1997; Clemons, 1998; Cline, 1996; Gatteau, 2000). The remaining question is how do women connect to the old boys to secure the support needed for their success?

There are certain personal qualities which also helps women to achieve the positions and sustain them. When asked how she obtained the position as Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Madison in an interview with Shinn (2002), Dr. Donna Shalala, who was named by *Business Week* as one of the top five managers in higher education, replied: "Right through my career, I overreached...I've never been in an administrative position in which the consensus was that I actually had the qualifications" (p. 21). In other words, her high aims, strong confidence, courage, and risk-taking behaviors paved her way to success. After examining 10 senior women administrators' advancement experience in public universities in one southern state, Dietz (1997) obtained similar results and concluded that these women advanced because of their own competence, independence, and risk-taking behaviors. While Brown, Van Ummersen, and Sturnick (2001) warned aspiring women not to accept the presidency at troubled institutions, President Marlene Springer (Springer, 2003) at the College of Staten Island in New York City reflected on her journey to the presidency and stressed the importance of being willing to take risks. She believed that avoiding the troubled institutions and waiting for the "good fits" was impractical. She pointed out the fact that most troubled institutions were still led by women and that often boards at these institutions were willing to risk appointing women presidents because men had failed. Therefore, she encouraged aspiring women to take calculated risks and leaps of faith.

## 2.3 CONCLUSION

At the end of her dissertation study, Cline (1996) affirmed, "An enormous amount of work still needs to be done...to expand this incomplete knowledge by exploring obstacles to success" (p. 194). Other doctoral researchers (Anglis, 1990; Cline, 1996; Dietz, 1997; Flanagan, 2002; Rosynsky, 2002; Thompson-Stacy, 1995; Zakery, 1991) also agreed that many questions about what it takes for women to become effective and successful leaders in higher education remain unanswered. They all recommended additional inquiries into how women have successfully addressed issues such as gender stereotypes, exclusion from the old boys' networks, and women's strategies for success to expand the knowledge base on successful women leaders in higher education.To make matters worse, some women leaders get tired of

playing the political game and resent the tremendous amount of responsibilities, demands, and stress placed on them. As a result, they leave the executive positions or even the education profession (Die, 1999;Dietz, 1997; Harris, Lowery, & Arnold, 2002; Jones, 1993; Marshall, 1994; Schmuck, Hollingsworth, & Lock, 2002; Sturnick, 1991).

Therefore, all possible means should be used to stop the loss of women's talents as well as to support, inspire, and encourage more women to choose higher education leadership as a profession, including expanding the knowledge base on success strategies and tactics for women in the academy, which is why this research endeavor was initiated. Majority of the studies on women administrators are conducted in the part of the United States. Very few studies have been conducted on the Indian women administrators. The barriers faced by women in different parts of countries are similar in nature. In almost all the studies the family responsibilities was the major barrier reported. Apart from this there were other barriers which were lack of mentors, lack of networking, gender biasness, stereotype etc being reported. Most of the researchers used a survey design, questionnaires that fail to provide an insight into the life of women administrators and they just attempted to list the barriers faced by them and the strategies used by them. Very few studies were of qualitative in nature which used interview for data collection. Most of the studies were comparative in nature which compared the experiences of male and female administrators. These studies do not attempt to describe and understand the experience of women administrators from the perspective of women themselves. Relatively few studies have reported stories concerning the women administrators. In spite of being the several barriers existing, some of the women administrators have succeeded to reach the top-level position by overcoming the existing barriers. The common strategies adopted by these women administrators which emerged from the review of literature are: most of them had mentors, had created strong networking and had role model. Other strategies followed are arranging their own support systems to balance the dual responsibilities of family and work. There is no common path which emerged by reviewing the literature which these women administrators can follow to be successful.