POSITION STATUS LEVEL AND FACTORS PERCEIVED AS

AFFECTING CAREER ACHIEVEMENT AND POSITION OBTAINMENT FOR

KANSAS WOMEN IN HIGHER EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION

by

Jill Allyn Sundell

B.S., Baker University, 1981

Thesis
1984
S963
c.2

Submitted to the Department of
Counseling and the Faculty of the
Graduate School of the University
of Kansas in parital fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science in Education.

_____
Professor in Charge

_____
Committee Member

_____
Committee Member

_____
For the Department

ABSTRACT

Women comprise only 16 percent of all administrative positions
at higher education institutions. As the importance of the adminis-
trative position increases, the percentage of women decreases. In
1979, women held 7.5 percent of all presidencies. A majority of
these headed institutions with fewer than 3,000 students. However,
the number of women chief executive officers increased by 48 percent
between 1975 and 1980. A greater number of women are entering the
administrative field each year, while no clear steps to advancement
have been defined.

Little research has been conducted on women administrators at
different administrative levels. This research examines factors
perceived to contribute to career achievement and position obtain-
ment and status level. A sample of Kansas women administrators at
all institutional types and position levels (n=200) completed a
survey, Kansas Women in Higher Education Administration. The data
were analyzed using six seperate one-way analyses of variance pro-
cedures. No significant differences were found on any of the six
factors pertaining to career achievement and position obtainment.
A profile of Kansas women administrators is presented. The results are
discussed along with implications for further research.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

vii

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Rationale: Status of Women Administrators

Women students comprise over half the undergraduate student

population in American colleges and universities. In 1980,

women equaled some 50.7 percent of the enrollments in

post-secondary educational institutions (Higher Education Daily,

1980). Yet, a recent study by the College and University

Personnel Association (CUPA, 1978) found that only 16 percent of

all administrative posts in over 1,100 institutions were held by

women. The percent of women administrators in private institutions

rises to 21 percent. Only in private women's colleges do women

hold over half the administrative posts, 56 percent. The com-

parable figure for male administrators at all male colleges is

88 percent.

These figures decrease rapidly as the importance of the

administrative position increases, a phenomenon termed the

"pyramid syndrome" (Graham, 1974; Sandler, 1979). In 1978, women

held less than seven percent of the top executive positions at

white coeducational posts in four-year public colleges. Only

eight of these were at institutions with total enrollments

exceeding 10,000. While 135 women were chief executive officers

1

at four-year private colleges, 86 of these were of religious orders, typically all-women colleges. The total number of women chief executive officers at all two and four-year colleges was 219 in 1980. Though the number is small, it is a remarkable increase from 1975, which found a total of 148 women as chief executive officers. This is a gain of 48 percent in five years (Office of Women in Higher Education, 1980).

Some interesting trends in the increase of women chief executive officers include:

1. The rise of the woman president in two-year educational institutions. Five times as many women are now presidents of two-year public institutions.

2. As the number of women chief executive officers increases in public institutions, the proportion of women presidents who are members of a religious order decreases. Two-thirds of all women presidents were members of religious orders in 1975. In 1981, these only comprise 42 percent of all women presidents (Office of Women in Higher Education, 1981).

Many of the advances into top-level positions can be traced to a program sponsored by the Office of Women in Higher Education of the American Council on Education. This program, the National Identification Program, has been active since 1977, with major funding from the Council and the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

Developed to help qualified women in higher education administration gain visibility and access to top-level administrative posts, the program utilizes state and regional women administrators to identify women ready for top-level positions. National forums

are held inviting identified women to participate. Such forums
provide needed visibility with chief administrators. Nineteen
women who have attended these ACE forums are counted among the
new presidents.

The National Identification Program is a credit to the
influence of successful networking among women. The question of
whether a woman can obtain a top-level post in a college or univer-
sity has now been replaced by, "how can we best facilitate such
career advancement and how can we help increase a woman's effective-
ness once she has access to such positions?"

Purpose

While women and women's groups are generating programs to
better prepare themselves for the responsibilities of leadership
positions, institutions do little to recruit, train and promote
capable women into administrative positions. The effectiveness of
Affirmative Action is questionable (Kanter & Wheatley, 1978;
Kistler, 1979; Marshall, 1978; Van Alstyne, 1977). There is a need
for the development of a comprehensive plan of action by institu-
tions of higher learning. However, with the exception of net-
working, little is known about the differential effectiveness of
today's diverse programs aimed at teaching women strategies to
success in higher education administration. The importance of net-
working and mentoring are acknowledged as factors contributing to
the successful advancement of women (Women's Educational Equity
Communications Network, 1980).

> Data indicates that women are actively using con-
> tacts in seeking new positions, and in similar
> proportions to their male colleagues, but the
> reverse "flow" of information or perceived "fit"
> -- women being actively sought for positions in
> proportion to their male colleagues -- does not
> seem to be matching women's own initiative,
> especially in the non-chief's group (Capek, 1981).

Adkinson (1980) warns that women's networks, though suppor-
tive, are not sufficient sources of support. Where organizational
loyalty is held at a premium, visible participation in such net-
works may even prove detrimental to a woman's advancement.

Institutions have failed to develop structures which support
women's administrative careers. Marshall (1979 & 1980) and Widom
and Burke (1978) propose that the typical male socialization
pattern is not available to a woman. Women's limited access to role
models and other administrative women along with the interference
of ambiguity of intent during informal interactions with male
administrators restricts their professional socialization. Thus,
a woman often faces isolationism along with the extra-testing
associated with being a nontraditional participant in the adminis-
trative arena.

Female career role strain is one of the most researched
topics on career women. Balancing the culturally defined roles of
homemaker with a more self-defined role of professional requires a
woman to re-define her identity, and certainly, to rearrange her
life, feelings and attitudes. Marshall (1980) labels this period
"Transition" and maintains that no woman attains high positions and

performs comfortably and competently without going through Transition. Paddock (1978) found that the divided role of professional and homemaker is a major barrier to women's career development. She found that women respondents mention the divided role more frequently than any other barrier. This subject arises repeatedly in literature.

Institutional structures may cause strong deterrants for women administrators. These organizational realities intensify female career strain. No clear ladder outlines steps which women may take to insure rewarding positions (Moore, 1982). Such ambiguity and lack of certainty combined with the strain of integrating cultural roles for individual ones may discourage women from continued administration. Yet, figures show a growing number of women entering the field. While only eight percent of the student population in educational administration programs affiliated with the University Council for Educational Administration were female in the late 1960's (Cirincione-Coles, 1975), women earned 21 percent of the master's degrees in educational administration in 1971-72 and 29 percent of those awarded in 1975-76. In the same period, women's share of doctorates in educational administration rose from six percent to 20 percent (Frasher & Frasher, 1979; Stockard, 1981).

Kanter (1977) found that where individuals, whether male or female, see that the structure of opportunity limits their mobility and growth, they display behaviors stereotyped as female, such as limiting their aspirations and seeking satisfaction through

interpersonal relationships rather than from task performance. This confirms that structural characteristics of organizations rather than sex-linked personality traits or behavior create the major barrier to women's success in management. Kanter also found fewer sex differences than individual differences in leadership styles among women and men leaders in various group settings.

The recent advances in access to top-level positions and the increasing number of women in higher education administration combined with the continued lack of supportive structures in academic institutions increases the importance of identifying and examining specific factors influencing women's success at all levels of administration. This study attempts to clarify factors most relevant to the success of women administrators and examine the differential importance of those factors between women of varying position status.

The main questions of this study are:

1. Do women of different levels of status in academic administration differ on the degree that they perceive certain factors as important to their career achievement?

2. Do women of different levels of status in academic administration differ on the degree that they perceive barriers as influencing their career achievement?

3. Do women of different levels of status in academic
   administration differ in the degree that they perceive
   certain factors as important to their present position
   obtainment?

Hypotheses are presented in Chapter III.

Significance

The significance of this study lies in the identification and
examination of some potential factors influencing women's success
in higher education administration. The examination of the
differential effects of these factors on women of varying status
is necessary to identify trends or changes in the administrative
field. Such clarification is essential for the development of
valid strategies for institutional change toward better recruit-
ment, training and promotion of women in higher education adminis-
tration.

Summary

Men continue to greatly outnumber women in administrative
positions at institutions of higher learning. Through recent
efforts to increase the visibility of qualified women by networking,
the total number of women chief executive officers has increased
55 percent in five years. However, no clear ladder has been
defined to help women advance at all levels of academic adminis-
tration. This study attempts to clarify factors which have
influenced women at different levels of administrative status. The

differential importance of these factors according to position status is examined to detect trends in the advancement of women into administrative positions.

Definition of Terms

Sex Role Socialization - differential treatment and expectations one receives on the basis of gender.

Sex Role Orientation - the actual incorporation of masculine and/or feminine characteristics, independent of gender.

Roles - general outlines of expected behavior for individuals in different types of situations.

Traditional Roles - a role that has been handed down through generations in a culture and has come to be expected. The traditional role of women is defined in this study as that of wife and mother.

Role Conflict - when behavioral demands of multiple roles or demands within a role are incompatible and result in frustration over real or perceived pressures to meet these expectations.

Sexual Discrimination - the differential treatment of men and women on the basis of their gender, without consideration of individual differences in terms of ability, competence, inclination, or commitment.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The focus of the literature review for this study is the
social context and the higher education context of women and women
in academic administration. The social context examines historical
and present factors of women's employment and women's education.
The higher education context examines research on the status of
women in higher education administration, barriers to advancement,
factors influencing the achievement of women in higher education
administration and strategies for advancing in higher education
administration. Finally, a brief review of research on women in
Kansas Higher Education administration is presented.

Social Context

Women's Employment

Women's employment in the labor force increased nearly three
times as fast as the female population between 1975 and 1980. From
1975 through 1979 the number of women age 16 years and over
increased by 6.4 percent but the number participating in the labor
force increased by 17.3 percent. By 1979, for the first time,
more than half of all women over 16 years of age were employed or
seeking employment (U.S. Department of Labor, 1980). About 43

million women were in the labor force in 1979; they constituted
more than two-fifths of all workers. Women accounted for nearly
three-fifths of the increase in the civilian labor force in the
last decade--about 13 million women compared with more than 9
million men. The average woman worker is as well educated as the
average male worker; both have completed a median of 12.6 years of
schooling. The more education a woman has, the greater the likeli-
hood she will seek paid employment. Among women with four or more
years of college, about two out of three were in the labor force
in 1979 (U.S. Department of Labor, 1979).

Many changes occurred to increase the labor force participa-
tion of women during the past decade. The changes include a
dramatic increase of working age youths in the population and an
increase in school enrollment and education levels. Also signifi-
cant have been changes in marital and childbearing patterns leading
to decisions to defer marriage, have fewer children and, increasingly,
to terminate marriage by divorce (Lasch, 1978). In addition,
mothers are much more likely to work. About 13.4 million or 54
percent of all wives with children under 18 were in the labor
force in March, 1980. Although the mothers of school age children
remain much more likely to be in the work force (62 percent) than
those with children under six (45 percent), the proportion of
working mothers with preschoolers has risen a dramatic 15 percentage
points since 1970 (U.S. Department of Labor, 1981). Increasing
numbers of married women and mothers in the work force reflect both

the economic climate and changing perception of women's roles. The

number of working mothers has increased more than tenfold since

the period immediately preceeding World War II, while the number

of working women more than tripled (U.S. Department of Labor, 1980).

While women have gradually improved their labor force

position, the gap between average earnings of male and female full-

time, year-round workers continues. Two-thirds of all women

holding a job do so out of economic necessity, with those employed

full time contributing 40 percent of the average husband-wife

family's income (U.S. Department of Labor, 1980). Women cluster

in jobs whose financial rewards have traditionally been lower. In

1900 most members of the female labor force would be found in

agricultural, manufacturing, or domestic service jobs. Well over

half of all women continue to work in occupations in which at

least two-thirds are women and over 40 percent are employed in

occupations in which 80 percent or more are females. These

occupations continue to be categorized by less prestige, pay and

decision-making power than those dominated by men. More importantly

for this study, within professional occupations such as law,

medicine and academic administration, women are found in low-ranking

specialties, such as matrimonial and real estate work; public

health and psychiatry; and directors of financial aid, registrars,

and librarians (American Council on Education, 1981). Only 5.2

percent of women employed in 1975 were designated by the Bureau of

Labor statistics as managers and administrators, compared with 14

percent of men employed (World Almanac, 1977).

Women's Education

More than 200 years lapsed between the founding of Harvard in

1636 and Oberlin College's admission of women in 1837. Economic

factors contributed to the admission of women into the system.

Shrinking enrollments and scarcity of resources during the Civil

War opened many educational doors to women. The depressed economy

of the 1880's assisted women's entry into doctoral programs...

especially if financial and endowment monies were gained by the

admission of affluent females.

"Some of our best scholars have been ladies," commented

President Denison of Kansas Agricultural College at a meeting of the

Friends of Agricultural Education in 1871. There was, however, a

tendency for girls to concentrate in home economics and education,

while boys studied engineering and agriculture (Newcomer, 1959).

Women's role in higher education have fluctuated in the twentieth

century.

By 1929, two-fifths of the bachelor's degrees and 17 percent

of the doctorates awarded went to women. Lyson (1981) found that

the number of degrees awarded to women increased by over 90 percent

between 1966 and 1976 compared to an increase of about 70 percent

for men. Lyson standardized female growth rates to the national

average growth rate and indicated that women experienced a net

increase of 28,191 degrees. He found that at the same time that women were increasing their overall share of degrees, they were generally shifting out of slow growing fields in the sex neutral and traditional female areas and into fast growing areas across the curriculum spectre. He determined that seven of nine traditional male areas had net increases of women during the decade between 1966-1976. The net increase of women in traditional male areas was larger than the increase in either sex neutral or traditional female areas. Additionally, it was found that women increased their share of male degrees more than their share of sex neutral or traditional female degrees.

Gains of the number of women in higher education can be attributed both to legislation to ensure educational access and to increased recognition of the need for women to prepare for economic sufficiency. Women have expanded the range and scope of their studies and are no longer confined to traditional female fields. But, influenced by prevailing attitudes of appropriate occupational sex roles, many women still elect to prepare for the traditional fields of education, health, public affairs and services, the arts and home economics. Occupational forecasts identify few of these fields as strong prospects for expanded employment (U.S. Office of Education, 1980).

Higher Education Context

"If women are thinly represented on faculties, especially in traditional male fields, they are so rarely represented in top academic administrative positions as to be practically non-existent" (Carnegie Commission, 1973). Between 1930 and the late 1940's, 27 percent of full time faculty members were women. After 1949, the percentage declined steadily. In 1949-50, women constituted 24.5 percent of full time faculties, and in 1959-60, 22 percent. By 1976, the percentage had risen slightly to 24.2 percent. Since it is still largely from faculty that administrators are chosen, we are still trying to catch up to 1930 (Bennett, 1979).

Before 1974, few articles had been written about women in educational administration. Research on administrators centers on accounts of personal experiences or studies on one position, the chief executive officer. Hence, we do not have a comprehensive view of women administrator's careers. Moore (1982) suggests that while research on women administrators is limited in nature and scope, women do not possess similar faculty backgrounds nor are they likely to follow the same routes as men in top positions. The majority of research on women in educational administration is limited to determining the actual number of women in various posts. Such data, though necessary to determine women's status, is not sufficient to identify career paths or factors contributing to success in both positions. The following is a review of such status

research, research on barriers to advancement and research per-
taining to achievement in higher education administration.

Status

In 1970, Deckerd (1975) found that in all colleges and
universities with more than 10,000 students, there were no women
presidents and no women vice presidents. Twelve percent of the
academic deans were women and 17 percent of the assistant and
associate deans were women. In 1977, 95.1 percent of entering
freshmen were enrolled in institutions where all three chief execu-
tive administrators (president/chancellor, chief academic officer
and dean) were male (Astin, 1977).

Gappa and Uehling (1979) report a decrease in the percentage
of women employed in faculty and administrative positions from 28
percent in 1929-30 to 19 percent in 1959-60, and to 25 percent in
1977. A 1973 survey by the Carnegie Commission of Higher Education
cites the elimination of the Dean of Women positions and the
decreasing number of women presidents at women's colleges as reasons
for the decline. The Commission predicted that overcoming
inequities would become even more difficult due to declining enroll-
ments and the subsequent slowing of hiring.

As reported in this study's introduction, a recent compre-
hensive research study on the status of women and minorities in
higher education administrators at over 1,100 institutions shows
that women hold only 16 percent of the administrative positions
(College and University Personnel Association, 1979). The

proportion of women administrators is higher at private (21 per-
cent) as opposed to public (12 percent) colleges. Only in private
women's colleges does the proportion of women administrators rise
to 56 percent. Capek (1981) surveyed six institutions in the New
Jersey university system and found a similar proportion of women
administrators - 16 percent (29 out of 221).

The chief executive officer (CEO) has been the subject of a
majority of the research on women in higher education administra-
tion. In 1871, Frances Willard was named president of Evanston
College for Women, she became the first woman president of an
American college or university (Kane, 1965). She represented .18
percent of all presidents at that time. In 1970, 11 percent of
college presidents in the U. S. were women. However, 99 percent of
these were presidents of Roman Catholic women's colleges (Cohen &
March, 1974). The Chronicle of Higher Education (1970) reported
that less than three percent of public colleges had women presidents
compared to eight percent of private colleges.

In 1973, Thurston (1975) reported only five women presi-
dents of community colleges in the U.S. Today, women hold five
times as many presidencies in two-year community colleges than in
1975. As of 1979, women held 7.5 percent of all presidencies,
or out of 2,600 colleges and universities, 204 are headed by
women (Comment, 1980). Of the 204 women presidents, four head
institutions with over 20,000 students; eight head institu-
tions with over 10,000 students; 22 head institutions with

3,000 - 10,000 students, and 170 head institutions with fewer than
3,000 students.

Barriers Perceived

We must have some understanding of why there are so few women
in academic positions now before we can determine strategies to
help expand the pool. Women currently in administration admit they
were reluctant to seek their positions (Gross & Trask, 1976;
Schmuck, 1975). Coffin and Ekstrom (1979) asked subjects, women
school administrators, what they considered key roadblocks with
regard to unsuccessful applications for positions. The most
frequent reasons given were: sex discrimination (18 percent);
predetermined appointees (17 percent); predetermined attitudes of
hiring authority (15 percent); lack of experience (12 percent);
racism (10 percent); and age (10 percent). For many women, several
of these roadblocks were operative.

There is much literature on the special problems women
encounter. Fenn (1978) divides these problems into three areas:
psychological: negative self image, self defeating behaviors,
fear of success; social: attitudes about roles and role strain;
and organizational: barriers within organizations, persons and
groups at the work place. Clement, et. al., (1977) found that
even if a woman achieves an administrative position, she will not
receive the same sort of support from her male colleagues as the
men receive from one another. Professional women have reported that

interaction with their male colleagues is the most problematic
aspect of their jobs (Lockhead & Hall, 1976). Both Ester (1975)
and Schmuck (1975) view the problem of the low proportion of women
in school administration as having two causes: 1) discrimination;
2) low aspirations and ideas about "women's place." Nieboer (1975)
determined that role models or identification models of behavior
are essential for the development of a self concept, yet there are
few models of women in leadership positions for women to emulate.

Most of these identified barriers support the argument that
sex role stereotypes, sex role socialization and discrimination
diminish the probabilities that women will seek leadership positions
actively and that organizations will be receptive to those who do.

The literature on socialization, role conflict and sexual
discrimination and the success of women in higher education admin-
istration will be discussed.

Sex Role Socialization is the differential treatment and
expectations one receives on the basis of gender. Historically,
women have always been conditioned to be inferior (Schuman, 1971)
and have rarely taken opportunities to advance themselves
(Alexander, 1974). Because of their socialization, women are more
dependent on men, lack self confidence and underrate themselves
(Hoffman, 1973). "The literature indicates," says Broverman, "that
men and masculine characteristics are more highly valued in our
society than are women and feminine characteristics" (1970). This
inevitably leads to women developing a negative self-concept.

"Femininity and being female is socially devalued by members of both sexes" (Baumrind, 1972). Flammer (1971) found that the highest self esteem was associated with high sex role orientation in boys and low sex role orientation with girls. Women and girls, as well as men and boys, tend to value males and their accomplishments far more than they value females and their accomplishments (Bem & Bem, 1973; Flammer, 1971; McKee & Sherriffs, 1957, 1959; Mosher, 1972; Rosenkrantz, et al., 1968).

Horner (1969) cites evidence for a "motive to avoid success." Contributing to women's low opinion of themselves is the fact that stereotypically masculine traits such as independence, dominance, competition, achievement drive, leadership, decisiveness and logic are considered more socially desirable than are stereotypically feminine attributes such as dependence, emotionalism, submissiveness, passivity, indecisiveness and lack of logic (Broverman, et. al., 1970; Mosher, 1972; Rosenkrantz, et.al., 1968). Females are trained to accept a narrow, restricting societal definition of their role (Cairns, 1975) that tells them what they can and cannot do and be. Sex role stereotyping is more restrictive for women, especially in the area of jobs, where "the range of acceptable choice is much narrower for women than for men" (Cairns, 1975). Other things being equal, people will choose careers that are consistent with their beliefs about themselves (Terborg, 1977).

However, Alper (1973) suggests that some women can accept competition and achievement as part of the feminine role. Feather

and Raphelson (1977) found that women seemed to display less fear of success than was indicated by Horner (1969). Nevertheless, fear of success "is assumed to be a stable personality characteristic learned early in life as part of female sex role standards" (Karabenick & Marshall, 1974). The Department of Labor's statistics often conflict with traditional attitudes regarding women's work participation. For example, assumptions regarding their long-term labor force attachment (i.e., that women are intermittent workers) are not confirmed. Statistics on labor turnover indicate that net differences in job turnover rates for women workers are comparable with men employed at similar job levels and under similar circumstances. Another indication of the stability of women in the work force is the increase in work-life expectancy which moved from an average of 12.1 years in 1940 to 20.1 years in 1960. While on the job, women demonstrated the same rates of absenteeism as men. A study on the total loss to the American economy from work absences found that the cost of absenteeism by women was also comparable to men's. These favorable findings for women workers emphasize the importance of judging work performance on the basis of individual achievement rather than upon assumptions based on gender stereotypes (Department of Labor, 1969).

A review of the motivation, personality, and work-related characteristics of women in male-dominated professions found that sex stereotypes are not substantiated. However, there was some evidence that women in nontraditional professions have less

ambition and lower commitment to their jobs than do men (Ashburn, 1977).

Studies on the effects of sex role socialization specifically on women in higher education administration demonstrate how this stereotyping can hinder women's advancement in academia. Considering traditional stereotypes of feminine and masculine characteristics, it is evident that "to pursue higher education and/or careers forces women to assume personality traits which may be opposite from those of their early socialization experiences" (Damico & Nevil, 1978). Tibbetts (1975) studied women in higher education and concluded that women accept their inferior status as genuine. The perceived consequences (that they will appear unfeminine, etc.) quite logically, "act as barriers to women's occupational aspirations" (Cohen, et. al., 1978).

Marshall (1981) researched the "professional socialization" patterns of entry women in academia. She concluded that the usual socialization patterns are not available to a woman. She must create her own. She found that socializing patterns set the odds against aspiring women. There are no incentives or supports for women in male-dominated professions. Many of the task-learning opportunities are not open to her; the career norms are often not relevant, only male-appropriate. She seldom has access to sponsor-protege socialization because men and women are not accustomed to working as caring, supportive colleagues as in the sponsor-protege relationship. Again, ambiguity of intent interferes

with such informal interactions between men and women since they may give the appearance as love or sexual relationships. When a woman has to create her own socialization network, she expends extra time and energy (which she has little of) at the point of initiation into a profession.

Role Conflict results when behavioral demands of multiple roles or demands within a role are incompatible and result in frustration over real or perceived pressures to meet these expectancies. Acceptance of stereotypes promotes role conflict. Many women are caught in the cross currents of change. Despite the dramatic shift in cultural values, both "old" and "new" values coexist. In the absence of absolutes, women are subjected to enormous conflicts of values with resulting role conflict. Increasingly, women are identifying more with their careers and less with their families (Parelius, 1975). Having a family enhances a man's academic position and hinders a woman's. Astin and Bayer (1972) found that the greater the number of children a male administrator had, the higher rank and salary...not true for women administrators. The decade from 25-35 years of age is critical for both child-bearing and laying the ground for successful professional strategies. Marriage places the same restrictions on geographic mobility for women academics as for other professionals but often with even more restrictive consequences. Institutional restrictions against hiring one's own graduates, accordingly, have a more

negative effect on married women than on married men (Gappa &
Uehling, 1979).

"Current mothering and administrator roles are so incompatible
that even self-defined women cannot find ways to manipulate, inte-
grate, and find sufficient substitutes. Some women delay entry
into the career until way late, some do not become mothers. We
cannot tell how many mothers simply do not become administrators"
(Marshall, 1981). Palley (1978) found an inverse relationship
between marriage and family obligations and administrative career
mobility among women subjects. His subjects were Academic
Administration Internship Program (AAIP) alumni (of ACE). There
was no such relationship of this variable to administrative career
mobility apparent for male respondents. When this finding was
taken together with the written comments made by the female
respondents to the questionnaire, the limiting role of marriage and
family responsibilities for women becomes apparent. Several
married women observed that their career patterns were curtailed
by their husband's career. No male respondent commented on career
limitations caused by his wife's professional goals and aspirations.
It is a reality that family responsibilities alter career patterns
for women with career goals in academic administration in ways
that they do not affect men. Many women seem to have resolved role
conflict by deciding not to marry or, increasingly, divorce.
Hochschild (1975) found that divorced women were more successful than
either single or married women, the opposite being true for men.

Marshall (1979) proposes that a newly appointed woman administrator must replace the learned behaviors appropriate for the adult woman with new behaviors and develop a new definition of self to succeed as an administrator. Such women are able to find sufficient access to socialization and sufficient career role strain in management techniques to become self-defined and successful.

Sexual Discrimination is the differential treatment of men and women on the basis of their gender, without consideration of individual differences in terms of ability, competence, inclination, or commitment. That outright discrimination is a factor in the low proportion of women professionals has been documented (Abramson, 1975). Women are perceived sterotypically and are relegated to the positions with low opportunities and are then observed as fitting the stereotypic behaviors for women because low opportunity prospects discourage attitudes and behaviors necessary for upward mobility. In male-dominated careers, ability becomes primary and the so-called feminine attributes become less essential. Feldman and Kiesler (1973) suggest that ability (an instrumental attribute) is essential as a criterion for prestige positions, while motivation (an expressive attribute) is thought to be a qualifier for less prestigious jobs (i.e., secretary). Ability is generally identified as a male attribute, while motivation is generally identified as a feminine attribute.

The cumulative effect of past discrimination has prevented women from gaining necessary skills and experience (Terborg, 1977). The "Null Environment Hypothesis," developed by a University of Chicago study, states that an academic situation which neither encourages nor discourages students of either sex is inherently discriminatory against women because it fails to take into account the differentiating external environments from which they come (U.S. Office of Education, 1980). Widom and Burke (1978) found that women junior faculty were the more likely than other faculty to report having experienced sexual discrimination. The most frequently chosen discriminatory category was "in hiring," followed by "other."

Still, many studies have found that women report having experienced no discrimination (Cochran, 1978; Ironside, 1981; Montagu, 1974). Cochran (1978) determined that discrimination alone does not account for the lack of women administrators in academia. She surveyed women in Texas, Florida and Washington (n=207) and the data concluded that women in administration do not view themselves as objects of discrimination. Montagu (1974) explained that some women are not aware of the injustices that have been committed against them and do not recognize the inequity of their position. "As a result of years of sex role stereotyping via the socialization process, both males and females fail to recognize indirect discrimination because it is built into the system" (Dietsch, 1978).

Achievement

Ironside (1981) suggests that the issue of barriers has been widely addressed in the literature. She suggests a study dealing with positive rather than negative factors; with what has enhanced women's careers rather than blocked them, with ambition fulfilled rather than thwarted. Studies where factors have been identified as positively influencing career achievement in higher education administration will be reviewed.

Many women reach the bottom of the hierarchical ladder some-what unintentionally. Adams (1979) interviewed sixty successful women who made it to the top and found a consistent pattern in getting to the point of departure. These successful women began to plan careers only when they discovered that they were being successful. They then changed their perceptions about work from doing a job to having a career.

Larwood and Wood (1977) described successful women as people who have a high degree of job satisfaction, enjoy solving problems, enjoy success, and look forward to future advancement. They generally credit their success to careful use of every opportunity to demonstrate and develop their abilities. Another key to their success was their ability to break into the informal communications networks and to demonstrate their ability and cooperation. Lynch (1978) found the successful career woman to be better at detail, extremely flexible, persevering and to have a good sense of humor.

These women attribute their success to a good education, hard work, understanding bosses and/or husband, good timing and good luck.

Crawford (1982) surveyed men and women presidents, academic vice presidents and academic deans to determine what skills are perceived to lead to success in Higher Education Administration. The ten most important skills are listed:

1. Maintaining high standards of ethics, honesty and integrity in implementing the goals of the institution.
2. Demonstrating knowledge of institutional resources, such as time, personnel, funds, materials, and other facilities to implement programs.
3. Applying both concepts of fairness and techniques for personnel appraisal related to compensation, promotion in rank, and awarding of tenure.
4. Having the combination of diplomacy, firmness, and self-confidence to implement planning decisions with a minimum of institutional disruption.
5. Possessing the ability to speak, read, write, and express thoughts in a clear, coherent manner.
6. Possessing stability, objectivity, and composure in times of stress.
7. Being able to think well on one's feet when faced with unexpected or disturbing events in large group meetings.
8. Being open to new ideas and suggestions and being able to adjust to meet new situations.
9. Being honest, open, and dependable in dealings with subordinates.
10. Being able to deal with frustrations without becoming hostile or defensive toward others.

Three of the ten most important skills perceived involve the communication process. Crawford noted that no financial planning skill was rated as most essential, interesting, in light of recent budget restraints and emphasis on budget programming. She also noted that the emphasis on teaching and scholarship which is found

in the literature was not supported in her study. This may indicate that fewer administrators are rising from the faculty ranks.

Cliff (1981) interviewed six top women administrators at the University of Kansas. They attributed their success to their intelligence, curiosity, willingness to take risks, self-confidence and understanding of their own abilities, luck, hard work, contacts made and continued, and determined outlook. Many researchers have found successful women and women administrators to possess extra-ordinary abilities, intelligence and determination. There is an apparent need to examine women at various administrative levels to determine if top level success is available to women only with extraordinary personalities and abilities.

Soldweden (1977) asked 1,259 members of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors (NAWDAC) to describe their greatest professional strength. Twenty-nine percent described a specific skill: organizing, administration and management, leadership, decision-making, efficiency, political expertise. Twenty-nine percent also cited interpersonal skills: ability to relate to students, relationships with students and staff; public relations and communication; ability to inspire confidence, to persuade others. Twenty-six percent gave a personal characteristic as to their greatest professional strength: tolerance, patience, diplomacy, tact, flexibility, integrity, honesty, dedication, drive, energy, tenacity, sense of humor. Sixteen percent felt that their experience or seniority on the job was their primary source of

professional strength. Lack of proper credentials or a specified skill (group skills, finance, budgeting, political naivete) were described by 40 percent of the respondents as their greatest professional limitation. Personality characteristics (defensiveness, intolerances, expecting too much from others, impatience, worry, anxiety, fatigue, discouragement) were cited by 39 percent.

Coffin and Ekstrom (1979) asked women to describe factors which might have contributed to their success. It was obvious from their wide variety of responses that no single factor opens the door to administration. The two most often cited were good credentials and hard work (10 percent and 8 percent respectively). The success factors reported were grouped roughly into three categories: personal traits mentioned by 60 percent; situational factors, 20 percent; and experience, 20 percent. Hard work was the most important personal trait followed by general competence, adequate health, stamina and vigor, and human relations/interpersonal skills all tying for the next three most frequently mentioned abilities. The situational factor most often considered helpful to success was contact through professional relationships in general, as well as with males able to provide entree. This was followed by making immediate use of every possible opportunity and being in the right place at the right time; good luck; a mate who encouraged professional growth; ability to devote weekends and evenings to work tasks; encouragement from men in the field; opportunity to build a professional reputation; and opportunity to

be visible and to produce. The possession of good credentials was considered the most important experience factor. Involvement in community affairs and other meaningful organizations ranked second, followed by appropriate experience and a good professional reputation.

An apparent trend in most of the research on factors relating to success in academic administration is communication: inter-personal skills; contacts with others - both men and women; and involvement in professional organizations. Cochran (1978) surveyed 207 Texas, Florida and Washington women who identified relating well to people as their strongest asset. MacConkey (1979) advocates the acquisition of personal power as the key element for advance-ment. She goes on to say that the acquisition of personal power is made through a series of constant contacts and sharing of informa-tion. Widom and Burke (1978) found that junior faculty women's ratings were significantly higher than men's for knowing people in the profession, joining professional organizations, taking an active role in organizations, and serving on University committees. However, the differences reflect the extent of endorsement rather than a general pattern of endorsement...this led them to suggest that female faculty know what is important but not necessarily how important. Palmeiri and Shakestrift predict that to get ahead, women must be extremely competent at every stage of their advance-ment. They must master the skills of administration and at the same time learn the informal mechanisms of communication (1979). I will

examine more fully three vehicles for advancement and support commonly used by successful women administrators: mentors, networks, and internship.

Mentors have been the subject of much discussion in recent literature. In 1976 Elizabeth Tidball examined successful women listed in Who's Who in America and found that an extremely large percentage of these women had attended women's colleges. This discovery led her to conclude that "the development of young women of talent into career-successful adults is directly proportional to the number of role models to whom they have access" (Tidball, 1973). The more women on the faculty of a particular department, the greater the percentage of women who chose to specialize in that field, whether or not it was "traditional." When there were only one or two women on a particular faculty, the effectiveness of the role modeling was diminished by suggesting the deviance of women in that field. But in greater numbers, women faculty functioned as effective role models, making non-traditional occupational choices appear "normal" to students (Swoboda & Roberts, 1980).

Hennig and Jardim (1976) found women in their sample to establish important mentor relationships that aided them in their climb up the hierarchy. As these women became more established in their careers, the importance of this mentor relationship diminished. Queralt (1982) studied the importance of mentors on faculty and administrators in the Florida university system in 1980: Her major conclusions were:

> 1) mentors appear to contribute significantly to the
> advancement of the academic careers of faculty members
> and academic administrators...respondents reaching
> the top academic ranks, the top income levels, the
> top levels of satisfaction from job and career, and
> the high-level administrative positions had experienced
> mentorships (as proteges) more frequently than
> respondents whose attainments in these areas were
> lower.
> 2) Faculty members and academic administrators without
> mentors seem to be at a disadvantage, particularly
> those whose aim is to achieve top levels of perfor-
> mance, prestige, and satisfaction.

Dalton, Thompson and Price did some of the important first work on

mentoring and career development. They found that mentors are

usually very similar to their protege and that there are many

variables that go into a successful mentoring relationship (1977).

That women holding administrative positions are more likely

than men to cite encouragement from superordinates as a major

factor in their move into administration is well documented

(Estler, 1975; Gross & Trask, 1976; Schmuck, 1975). Schmuck's

respondents noted that the absence of role models dampened their

own aspirations (1975). One who knew another woman in a higher

administrative position mentioned the importance of that woman as

an influence on her career aspirations. Nieboer (1975) noted

the lack of role models facing women in administration and that

with few role models, an increase in applications and appointments

is likely.

Networks have been developed because of this very lack of

visibility. Sheila Tobias, Wesleyan Associate Provost and founder

of the Concerns of Women in New England Colleges and Universities

described networking as a "response to the phenomenon that the top

jobs are handled behind the scenes." Networking involves con-

sciously associating oneself with other women for mutual support,

the developing of mentor relationships between women, getting to

know other women administrators and sharing information regarding

job openings. The National Identification Program is an attempt

to address in a systematic way, the problem of visibility. Because

opportunities for women to demonstrate leadership have been limited,

women's potential for leadership has been underestimated and

underrated. The National Identification Program is a program

specifically designed to increase the ability of educators to

visualize and to place women in leadership roles.

Capek (1981) surveyed 2,200 women and men administrators in

New Jersey colleges and universities. What emerged from her data

was that women were serving as contacts for other women and that

the data on sex of contact, for both internal and external moves,

confirm that women are even less part of the male networks than

was anticipated. Men are more likely to serve as contacts for

women who moved up within their institutions, but even here, the

numbers are less than one would expect given the proportion of

women citing use of contacts (over 50 percent). One hundred and

fifty-one out of 848 contacts were women. That 18 percent,

however, accounted for over 40 percent of all women using contacts.

Women numbered less than a quarter of the contacts used by

respondents changing institutions, but those women accounted for

over half of women respondents' contacts. Seventy-eight percent of the women respondents indicated that they belonged to informal working coalitions, networks, or special interest groups, with 50 percent of that number specifically involved in women's groups or networks.

Increased sensitivity, professional information, clarification of issues, and professional contacts are the benefits of networks most frequently cited. Women's networks, at least, would appear to be working, however Capek (1981) suggests that more imaginative efforts are needed to facilitate women's active inclusion into existing male networks and to find innovative ways of confronting the perceptual bias and stereotyping which still seem to be the major barriers to women's advancement.

Internships have been regarded as highly attractive vehicles for bringing women into administration. Internships imitate the informal processes of sponsorship and guided socialization. Kanter and Wheatley (1978) maintain that women's increased participation in training programs and in administrative roles would reduce uncertainty about their probable behaviors. Men may not be as threatened because often the culturally legitimate relationship of the woman as subordinate is maintained, women can learn organizational norms and men can predict their behavior.

Andre and Edwards (1978) report that recently training programs have more narrowly focused their geographical range, such as HERS Summer Institute for Women. Though this may be beneficial

for networking, they also express some reservations about training

programs. Specifically, that supplemental programs do not substi-

tute for academic credentials or the successful faculty career.

"They work best as added credentials for persons already in place."

They can be useful in making or modifying career plans; can con-

tribute to a woman's sense of identity; increase visibility and

provide access to female role models. Hochschild also has reser-

vations with these training programs specifically for women.

"Efforts like HERS can be seen as efforts to 'resocialize' women

to the demands of the male work place." She feels that women will

have limited success in administration as long as they are expected

to fulfill the roles women traditionally fill in our society.

Women will experience nothing but limited success until there is

a redefinition of academic jobs in ways that will make them more

open and attractive to women (1975).

Affirmative Action

What part has legislation played in advancing women in higher

education administration? In 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson

issued an executive order for Affirmative Action in order to combat

discrimination by federal contractors against minorities. Since

1968, all educational institutions with federal contracts over

$10,000 have been prohibited from discriminating in employment on

the basis of sex. In addition, since 1973, all educational

institutions, public and private, receiving $50,000 or more in

federal contracts or grant funds, have been required by the federal

government to have affirmative action plans, including numerical

goals and timetables. Institutions in violation are subject to

delay of pending government contracts and/or ineligibility for

future contracts. Guidelines provided by the government in

October of 1972, emphasize that Affirmative Action goes beyond

nondiscrimination in that it involves "deliberate and positive

efforts on the part of institutions to rectify existing inequities

that result from past discrimination" (Carnegie Commission, 1973).

Other legislation affecting academia include Title IX of

the Education Amendments of 1972 which addresses discriminatory

practices derived from sex role stereotypes that socialize boys

and girls differentially. The Women's Educational Equity Act (WEEA),

signed in 1974, provides funding to increase women's participation

in all areas of education through the development of model programs

and projects. The program gives high priority to activities

designed to prepare girls and women to be effective leaders and

increase the number of women in administration.

Kanter and Wheatley (1978) address the issue of whether

Affirmative Action has really helped women. They have indicated

that Affirmative Action has contributed significantly to more

equitable hiring procedures.

> Affirmative Action has established defined hiring
> procedures and new hiring patterns, all of which
> are designed to make hiring more equitable. Hiring
> is now more public, defined, and announced. Open

searches instead of automatic promotion are con-
ducted. There is more concern with skills needed
and these skills tend to be defined in searches.
Personnel policies tend to be written, and there
are defined titles and conditions of employment.

However, they feel that,

Affirmative Action is more likely to increase the
number of women in technical jobs...more than any-
where else because of the greater ease of
translating these positions into skill terms.
Credentials and earning of tenure takes years...
judgments are still subjective. Affirmative Action
is an important first step but does not solve the
problems of equitable access to administrative
positions. There is little clarification of career
paths which tell people in one job how to become
eligible for another...while open searches and
automatic promotion permits a larger population of
eligibility, it means that the notion of career
growth through a sequence of developmental activities
can be lost if institutions do not pay explicit
attention to the development of their management
talent.

Others have stronger reservations regarding Affirmative

Action. The Carnegie Commission (1973) estimates that to reach an

average percentage of women in professorships of 30 percent in

1990, it would have been necessary to maintain a constant propor-

tion of women among hires of 50 percent between 1973-1990. Even

the most ambitious Affirmative Action plans cannot promise this.

Kistler (1979) states that at this time, there is little evidence

that Affirmative Action plans have either helped or hindered women

aspiring administration positions. Affirmative Action is far from

being implemented in most districts and although overt discrimination

is rare, many subtle discriminations still operate to exclude women

from top-level positions. While equal employment opportunity laws
exist to defend against some of the discriminatory hiring practices,
the chief selection criteria: years of experience - places men
far ahead. They also do not insure protection against subtle forms
of discrimination. It is doubtful that Affirmative Action has been
of much help. The very fact that women in administration consis-
tently prove to be more highly qualified and competent than their
male counterparts demonstrates that Affirmative Action has not
been a primary force in gaining them their posts. D.M. Tumpano
quotes, "equality of employment opportunity will exist not when
a female Einstein is appointed administrative assistant, but when a
woman schlemiel moves ahead as fast as a male schlemiel" (Tumpano,
1976).

Marshall (1975) found Affirmative Action implementation to
consist of simply shifting positions without regard to socializa-
tion, incentive and support structures which prepare women for
mobility in administration. It may, she proposes, harm women by
placing them in positions where discomfort and anxiety will be so
intense that they cannot succeed.

Loeb (1978) and Van Alstyne (1977) both report that while
Affirmative Action may have eased women's access to academic
employment, it has done little about salary inequity. Further,
Affirmative Action programs have been very expensive to administer;
the University of California system estimates expenditures of

$3,000,000 for 1974-75 alone. Loeb (1978) concludes that cost to institutions has far exceeded the benefit to the protected group.

A thorough understanding of the nature of discrimination as well as the legal means to combat it are vital tools for women seeking administrative roles. Although considerable progress has been made in changing laws, women have not obtained all their legal rights. While numerous laws exist to guarantee these rights including Title VII or the Civil Rights Act of 1964; the 1963 Equal Pay Act; Executive Order 11245, as amended by Executive Order 11375; Title IX of the Executive Order 11375; Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, our problem is educating women and men to the common but subtle aspects of discrimination.

Solutions

There has been much discussion in the literature of the best solution to the inequality of numbers of men and women in adminstrative positions. A few of the most popular suggestions will be reviewed. Gordon and Ball (1977) list twenty survival strategies women can use to prepare for administrative careers. Some involve learning to overcome the limitations of femal socialization such as 1) enroll in an assertiveness training course; 2) learn to "blow your own horn" to supervisors; 3) learn to delegate responsibility; 4) become familiar with the dynamics of team competition and teamwork; and 5) change the worn usage of the generic "he" in writing and speaking to reflect s/he. Other preparatory suggestions

are aimed toward building skills: 1) read journals and keep abreast
of current educational thought; 2) use the summer for taking
courses, doing volunteer work or whatever would be helpful to your
career; 3) join professional organizations and actively partici-
pate; 4) express a desire to serve on committees and special
projects and do so; and 5) find out when budget planning begins
and ask to be included (Gordon & Ball, 1977). Other suggestions
of Gordon and Ball involve cultivating support groups and communi-
cation "new girl" networks: 1) find out and get to know the
person in charge of Affirmative Action, equal employment oppor-
tunity, and Title IX; 2) keep posted on vacancies and share
information with other women; 3) join professional organizations
whose primary membership is women in administrative roles; 4) get
involved in the campus commission for women or equal opportunity
committee; and 5) support male colleagues who promote opportunities
for women. These solutions are geared towards the continued
and increased effort of individual women to combat the system and
get ahead.

Hochschild (1975) believes that academic careers are based
on assumptions inherently inimical to women in today's world.
She predicts that women will have limited success as long as they
are expected to fulfill the roles that women traditionally fill in
our society. She calls for a redefinition of academic jobs in
ways that will make them more attractive to women. The Carnegie
Commission (1973) suggested the following ways: 1) part time

positions should be reevaluated and given fringe benefits and tenure; 2) anti-nepotism rules must be abolished; and 3) maternity and parental leave should be granted for both sexes. "We cannot change the role of women in universities without changing the career system based on competition, and we can't change that competition structure without altering the economy, the larger the fit of supply and demand of workers." Such solutions are based on world economical change and are at the least, discouraging.

Kanter and Wheatley (1978) examined training programs as a strategy for advancing women in Higher Education Administration. Their conclusions were that women need a combination of formal and informal supports in order to advance. Formal supports include opportunity to develop increased skills, ample learning possibilities and new challenges. They need a chance to be creative and innovative, visible and recognized and to demonstrate their capacity to solve problems critically. Informal supports include relationships -- personal support systems close to home, senior persons willing to sponsor or endorse them, colleague acceptance and connections that give them access to information and a chance to trade favors.

Kanter and Wheatley concluded after interviewing directors of five Carnegie-sponsored training programs, reviewing 180 questionnaires returned by program participants, conducting thirty personal interviews with 25 key senior administrators from campuses around the country, reviewing the literature and holding

conversations with directors of other kinds of programs concerned with improving the status of women, that training programs are most effective to 1) senior women--due to the extra amount of prestige and connections with prestigious individuals and management training suitable for top jobs, and 2) entry women--to gain job experience. Though they found training programs to give women administrators a burst of energy, they have no influence over job characteristics of participants and cannot change the opportunity structure for individuals. Opportunity involves eligibility for advancement via the acquisition of skills, the chance to learn and demonstrate new skills and the existence of bridging positions that help one move away from the limits of the job definition of the position and enlarge the range of the position.

They suggest that institutions, through funding projects, should provide on-the-job training to develop explicit management development programs for women and men. Such training would be in organizational, financial or technical skills. The skills women are seeking to acquire are not different, in many cases, from those needed by men in administrative positions, and while women's networks are important, they advise that women become connected to men who are still the primary decision makers.

They suggest the provision of institutional projects in which a balanced number of men and women, faculty and administrators and junior and senior personnel tackle topics which are of concern to the institution and which will effect favorably to its future

course. Such projects must have adequate release time for the more
junior people and be of some length in duration. These projects
would provide opportunity for enlarged institutional knowledge and
connections. Project teams would benefit institutions as well as
individual women.

Moore (1982) agrees that the role of institutions in the
shaping of careers has been underrated. She found that a signifi-
cant number of administrators moved within their current institutions.
This contradicts the belief of the necessity of career mobility for
top level administrators. Overall, when both degrees and positions
were considered, large, doctoral-granting institutions were the
most inbred for administrators. Knowledge of a particular kind of
institution is valued above general administrative expertise. This
also leaves one an advocate for individual institutional training
programs. Colleges and universities should be encouraged to develop
and institute their own administrative training programs, including
internships, for their own faculty and low echelon administrators.
Rippey and LeCroy (1978) report that such a program instituted in
the Dallas community college district was evaluated as very
successful.

Blaska (1976) encourages educational institutions to help
women achieve equal opportunity in leadership roles by: 1) sponsoring
conferences for women who aspire to management positions; 2) identi-
fying talented women and nominating them to posts on commissions,
etc., where they will gain important experience; 3) providing

opportunities to participate in short term internships and
apprenticeships and 4) assisting women in getting the graduate
training and academic credentials associated with leadership.

Finally, Hays (1978) views a systematization of hiring
practices as the answer to inequality. He feels that an active
commitment by the governing board and the chief executive officer,
by setting hiring goals, is a necessity. This commitment must be
demonstrated in two ways, by example and through operating pro-
cedures. Institutions need to establish by department and operating
units within the administration goals by occupational level for
Affirmative Action hiring.

Administrative Level

Very few studies were found by this author that examined the
level of position status in relationship to factors affecting
career achievement. Mark (1980) randomly sampled 561 higher
education administrators. Most importantly, she found significant
differences on family orientation scales, career orientation scales,
and self-orientation scales for administrators at different
administrative levels. Administrative level was significant on the
family orientation scale for married administrators with regard
to percentage of household chores done by someone other than the
subject or subject's partner. Administrative level was significant
on career orientation scale, "Professional Activities," "Activity
and Variety of Work Experience," and "Amount of Job Activity."

There was an interaction between marital status and administrative level on the self-orientation scale and the career orientation scales, "Importance of a Career" and "Limits on Job Mobility." In each case, married, high status administrators scored higher on each of these scales. Females did not differ significantly from one another on the self-orientation scale. Females scores were disordinal with respect to administrative level for this scale. This was the reverse of the pattern found for males. Males differed significantly from one another with scores that were ordinal with respect to administrative level. Male chief's self-orientation score was highest, followed by deans, other administrators and non-administrators. While females' scores for the self-orientation scale were significantly higher than males' overall, there was no interactive effect found between administrative level and self-orientation for the female subjects. Females, compared to males, had significantly higher "self-orientation" scores at the two lowest administrative levels and experienced a greater amount of crises and conflict at these levels.

Mark's (1980) data suggests that women and men in high administrative positions experience much higher levels of activity and variety of experience. Married top-level administrators feel greater limits on their job mobility, males and female, and see their jobs as more important and are more self-oriented. Mark concluded that females, more so than males, perceived their careers in more positive terms, had greater limits on mobility, and perceived the

positive consequence of their careers more highly than did males. However, females in low-level positions experienced greater amounts of crisis and conflict. This author found no studies specifically examining women at different administrative levels and factors that contribute to their achievement.

Profile of a Woman Higher Education Administrator

Much has been written on the "typical" administrator in higher education. Research suggests, however, that stereotypes are indeed changing and myths about administrative roles and patterns are being contradicted. While Capek (1981) found that men and women use the same strategies to move up in administration, women were more aggressive in pursuing these strategies. In contrast, Leviton and Whitely (1981) found that job seeking patterns of men and women differed: men sought more jobs and obtained more offers. In this study, women Ph.D.'s were not as successful as male Ph.D.'s when they did use the same methods. Overall, women failed to use two important sources of job offers: job placement centers and announcements to departments. Women tended to rely exclusively on their professors, answering ads or sending out direct inquiries, all less effective methods of job attainment.

Nieboer (1975) suggests that a profile of personality and personal history characteristics of successful top level women administrators in nontraditional positions in coeducational colleges and universities would help break the cycle of few role models;

hence, few aspirants, and would indicate whether women holding these positions have common characteristics that can be identified.

Reeves (1975) interviewed 96 women administrators in higher education and found an overwhelming percentage were single (71%). Twenty-four percent were married and four percent were divorcees. She concluded from her sample that the great majority of women in higher education are single. Pfiffner (1976) found a majority of her subjects (top-level California women administrators) were married and had been continuously for 25 years. Her typical subject worked in a large California community college in a third-level administrative position with a title of Dean, was 52 years of age, and had been married for 12 years. Cochran (1981) gathered data on 34 women who held positions of executive leadership in professional organizations between 1921-1971. She concluded that marital status did not appear to be a factor in the exercise of a professional leadership role. Still, only 35 percent of her sample were married for some period of their lives. Forty-four percent of the subjects were over 50 when they were elected to their leadership offices. Fewer than half (44%) had completed doctoral degrees. Cochran concluded that these top level women were dynamic, unusually dedicated to their fields, and pioneers in a new and emerging profession.

Palley's (1978) forty women respondents who were Administrative Associate Intern Program (AAIP) alumni were vastly different from male respondents. Whereas most of the male subjects were married,

only 12 (30%) of the women were married. Six of the married women had children at home and six had no children. Twenty-eight non-married women responded of which eight were members of religious orders and 60% (8) were presidents or chief academic officers of their institutions. This proportional success rate was not matched by any group of men who responded to the survey. The other 20 unmarried women did not fare as well in climbing up the ladder as their religious counterparts, but they were certainly more successful than the married women respondents. Palley (1978) found an apparent inverse relationship between marriage and family obligations and administrative career mobility among women respondents; there was no such relationship to administrative career mobility apparent for male respondents. Cochran (1978) found the average female administrator to be over 40 years old, married and earning $15,000 to $20,000. Widom and Burke (1978) found almost two-thirds of the married females in their study reported having no children, while less than a third of the married males had no children. An explanation was found in that although most of the spouses of both sexes worked to some extent, over 90% of the spouses of females work full time and largely in the professions.

Gappa and Uehling (1979) found women in academe tend to postpone marriage and childbearing and reduce family size. In 1977, at top quality institutions, 40% of the women faculty were not married compared with 8% of men. For men, being married is seen as a great advantage while for women being single is a relative advantage,

i.e. flexibility, though in other ways is a disadvantage, i.e.,
perceived stability, creating a no-win situation for women.

Ironside (1981) studied 30 upper-level women administrators
in North Carolina's four-year colleges and universities and found
that all but four had earned doctorates; the most frequently held
post was "Dean of Schools" category in public institutions, and
"Academic Officers" group was the most common held position at
private institutions. Two-thirds of the women were over the age
of 45, only one was under 35. Most of the women were married or
had been married and over half were parents. The average family
size was between two and three children. The work history of
these women was quite continuous rather than discontinuous. Several
reported time out for raising children, for many the return to
graduate school was the only major interruption in the work
sequence. Some differences were noted among the younger and older
members of the sample. The younger women tended to go directly
from undergraduate to graduate study, the older women tended to
do so later. For both groups, however, the notion of "re-entry"
does not apply. Over half followed the most familiar route in
higher education, teaching. Others developed their careers in pro-
fessional fields such as nursing and library science (traditional).
For the total group, the period of service to their institutions
was about 11 years, with some serving a number of roles on their
way to the top. The subjects rarely questioned their competence and
felt well prepared for their roles, although many of them felt they

arrived by "being in the right place at the right time." The younger women (35-45) tended to be much more aware of their career planning, and could enumerate deliberate steps in the process: serving on particular committees, being available for assignments, attending particular professional meetings. The older women seemed to have done these things by instinct rather than by plan, a difference which Ironside suggests is a considerable change in the expectations for women and their career development.

More than any other single factor that subjects reported as important in order to perform well in their jobs was "being generalists." References to interpretive skills and the qualities of perspective and vision emerged and re-emerged throughout inter-views. In summary, Ironside finds a number of common themes apparent: 1) Few career breaks: continuous work history, similar to male counterparts; 2) Generalists: perspective and visions as crucial to administration and occasionally perceived conflict with male peers whose backgrounds tended to be more specialized; 3) Accepting responsibility: meeting opportunity head-on, sense of competence, personal energy and endurance; 4) Managerial exper-ience: managerial skills in other settings, planning, organizing, and team building; 5) Personal skills: great range of personal skills from warmth and wit to sensitivity and patience, all were articulate and engaging personalities; 6) Career skills: all had used past experience to the fullest to enhance their careers or further their development, could present themselves in the context

of new opportunities. Ironside concludes that these women were true

professionals, loyal to colleagues, concerned with their institu-

tions and devoted to their work.

Moore (1982) surveyed over 3,000 college and university

administrators nationally. This comprehensive study was one of the

largest of its kind, building one of the largest data bases avail-

able on upper-level administrators. A summary of the data follows:

1) Length of Time in Current Position. Most senior officials
   have held their jobs for not more than five years. Seven
   percent had held their position for under five years, 11
   percent had held their positions for three years, 14 percent
   had held their position for two years and 11 percent had held
   their position for under two years.

2) Marital Status. A majority (79 percent) of the administrators
   were married and living with their spouses. Of the remainder,
   8.4 percent had never married, 4.9 percent were members of a
   religious order, 4.5 percent were divorced, 1.7 percent were
   separated, and 1.5 percent were widowed.
      There were distinct differences in marital status between
   men and women. A majority of the males were married and
   living with their mates (87.8 percent). Only 43.7 percent of
   the female respondents were currently married. A greater per-
   centage of the women than the men were single and have never
   been married (23.8 percent) or are single by virtue of
   belonging to a religious order (15 percent). Only 4.5 percent
   of the male respondents had never been married and just
   2.4 percent belonged to a religious order. A higher per-
   centage of women than men were divorced or separated.

3) Number of Children. 35.5 percent of the respondents had two
   children, 23.2 percent had three children, and 11.6 percent
   did not have any children.

4) Type of Educational Degrees. Ninety-six percent had earned
   bachelor's degrees. The four top fields of study were:
   English and English literature (10 percent); history (10 per-
   cent); business administration (9 percent) and secondary
   education (7 percent) Approximately 80 percent of the admini-
   strators earned master's degrees. Three of the four most often
   studied fields can be grouped under the general heading of

education. The greatest number of these specialized in guidance and counseling, and 6.7 percent had the degree of business administration.

Those with doctoral degrees numbered 50.2 percent. The majority were earned in the area of education with the most popular specialty in higher education administration (13 percent). The second area was educational administration (9 percent), followed by educational psychology or curriculum with 8 percent.

5) Job Change. The majority of subjects answered "no" when asked if they were considering a job change. The percentage circling "yes" was 19.9 with 23.3 percent indicating "maybe." The most popular of the listed choices was a new position at a new institution (33 percent), consideration of a position outside of higher education (27.4 percent), similar position at a new institution (26.1 percent) and 19.7 percent preferred a new position at their current institution.

6) Position Obtainment. The factor of greatest importance in selecting an institution was the duties and responsibilities of the position (55.8 percent rated this category very high). Next in importance for moving to a particular institution was its geographic location. A high importance rating was marked by 29.4 percent and 26.7 percent answered "very high" in importance.

Contrary to Mark (1982) there appeared to be no difference according to sex in the response to satisfaction in their position. A substantial majority of the respondents (71.5) replied that they would choose to be an administrator again if they could start over.

Kansas Women Administrators in Higher Education

Cliff (1981) interviewed six top-level administrators at the University of Kansas. All had terminal degrees, five from large co-educational public universities and one from a small woman's college. Two immediately started working on their terminal degrees while four spent time working on other areas first. Two interrupted their work to have children while the other four have worked

continuously. Four of the six were tenured faculty and moved

through the ranks to administration, three at the same institution;

this is contrary to observations of Graham (1974). Again, a com-

petence in abilities and determination to accomplish what they

could arose. Five of the women were married, one had never

married and all described their husbands as encouragers of their

work. Four of the six in the sample have children (from 1-3)

which they also described as supportive.

The Kansas Planning Committee surveyed women in higher educa-

tion administration in the Spring of 1982 to determine the status

of women in Kansas institutions. The findings are summarized

below:

1) Only 19 (11 percent) of the administrative positions surveyed
   were held by women at the six Regent institutions.

2) Only one institution had a chief executive officer that
   was female and this institution was a private woman's
   college. (Note: since this survey was conducted, a woman
   was appointed president at a community college.)

3) Only 103 (18 percent) of the administrative positions surveyed
   were held by women at twenty-two private institutions.

4) The most popular positions for women at the state institutions
   were: Director of Affirmative Action (n=3); Dean of
   Nursing (n=2); and Chief Academic Officer (n=2).

5) The most popular position for women at the private institutions
   were: Director of Library Services (n=17) and Manager of
   the Bookstore (n=17). (Note: Bookstore Manager position is
   not considered an administrative position in most instances.)
   The next positions held most frequently by women at private
   colleges were: Director, Financial Aid (n=9); Director,
   Student Housing (n=9); and Director, Student Placement (n=9).

6) Looking only at the position of "Dean" at the State institu-
   tions, only five of the 55 Deans (9 percent) at the six
   State institutions were held by women. Of these, two were
   Deans of Nursing; one was a Dean of Allied Health; one was a
   Dean of Home Economics, and one a Dean of Student Life.
   With the exception of the last, all these positions are
   positions traditionally held by women in higher education
   administration. The "pyramid" syndrome is exampled by the
   data, accordingly, nine (14 percent) of the Associate Deans
   were found to be women and 10 (41 percent) of the Assistant
   Deans were women.

Summary

Chapter II has been a review of the literature relevant to

women in higher education administration. The social context and

the higher education context were discussed in regard to the

growing number of employed women in education and women in

education administration. Specific research on women in higher

education was discussed in terms of status; barriers perceived:

sex role socialization, role conflict, sexual discrimination;

achievement: mentors, networks, internships; Affirmative Action

and suggested solutions to the inequality of women in higher

education administration. While no studies were found on the

differential influence of certain factors and administrative level

of women, an article was reviewed examining administrative level,

marital status and scores on self, family and career orientation

scales with both men and women subjects.

Data was reported by several researchers on the "profile"

of an administrator in higher education. Studies were examined

reporting the difference between men and women administrators and

factors such as marital status, faculty status, job seeking

patterns, number of children, age at marriage and childbearing

and work histories. Finally, research on Kansas women administra-

tors in higher education was reviewed.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Introduction

The objective of this study is a better understanding of the factors that affect career achievement and position obtainment of women in Kansas Higher Education Administration and the relationship of these factors to level of status. In Chapter III the procedure for determining level of status and the survey instrument is discussed.

Subjects

Subjects were women identified by the Kansas Planning Committee of the National Identification Program as administrators in Kansas Higher Education. Women were identified by presidents and other women administrators from every Kansas institution of higher education including: three public institutions (over 15,000); three public institutions (under 15,000); 24 four-year independent institutions; 1 two-year independent institution; 1 municipal institution; 21 two-year community colleges (n=470).

All subjects who had previously completed and returned the program's "Personal Survey Form" were included in the sample (n=215). An additional 100 subjects who had no prior communication

with the program were randomly selected out of the entire list of
identified women administrators in Kansas. A total of 315 subjects
were contacted.

Level of Status

Position titles were placed in one of 20 categories and
identified by institutional type. This produced 58 position cate-
gories by institutional type. Three raters were utilized to rate
position categories according to their status in higher education
administration. The three raters were: The Coordinator of the
Kansas Identification Program who has been in Kansas Higher
Education administration for over 10 years; the Director of a
university administrative division at a small (under 15,000)
public institution who has been in Kansas Higher Education admini-
stration for 18 years; and the former Director of the Office of
Women in Higher Education, American Council on Education, and the
founder of the National Identification Program who had been in
Kansas Higher Education for a majority of her professional career.
The raters were selected for their extensive experience in Kansas
Higher Education.

The raters randomly scored the 58 position categories on a
1 to 5 scale on degree of status. Inter-rater reliability,
Pearson correlations are shown below.

TABLE 1

PEARSON CORRELATIONS OF RATERS
ON POSITION STATUS

	R1	R2	R3
R1	1.00	.58116	.6004
R2		1.00	.7095
R3			1.00

According to the above procedure, subjects were assigned a level

of status: 1 = low (n=43)

2 = middle (n=138)

3 = high (n=21)

Survey Instrument

The survey, Kansas Women in Higher Education Administration,

(see Appendix A) consisted of: part 1 - seventeen items relating

positively to career achievement; part 2 - nineteen items

reflecting barriers to career achievement; part 3 - sixteen items

relating to present position obtainment. Subjects were asked to

rate each item on a 1 to 5 (low to high) Likert scale indicating

the degree to which the item influenced their career achievement

and present position obtainment. Subjects were asked to indicate

which item in each part (1, 2 & 3) was the single most important. In all circumstances, "not applicable" could be indicated.

Part 4 of the survey asked subjects to compare themselves to their female and male colleagues on four items. Part 5 collected personal, status, and educational data.

Items for parts 1, 2, and 3 were categorized to be analyzed as follows:

Factors Contributing Positively to Career Achievement - Part 1 were divided into two factors: 1) items pertaining to significant others: mentor, spouse/partner, mother, father, sibling, friends and professional colleagues; 2) personal items pertaining to specific attributes of the individual: personal goal setting, previous job experiences, volunteer experiences, personality, time management abilities, staff and personal management abilities, decision-making skills, communication skills, honesty/ethics/ integrity. Ironside (1981) purports that careers depend on both individual and environmental factors, personal determination is not enough; the initiative of others are also needed. She views careers as having two dimensions--motivation and opportunity, choice and chance. Significant others in this study included any persons who could have been instrumental in the subjects' career achievement. The personal factor items were partially derived from the Administrative Skills Opinionnaire (Crawford, 1982). Subjects were given the opportunity to identify items not listed that were of importance to their achievement.

<u>Career Barriers Factor - Part 2</u> included those items from part 1, which upon their absence, could be seen as barriers to career achievement or, which could produce a negative influence on career achievement. Additional items which could produce a negative influence on career achievement were included. These items were selected for inclusion based on review of the literature on career barriers.

<u>Position Obtainment - Part 3</u> items were divided into three factors: 1) items pertaining to personal attributes - skill/abilities, reputation, self-diligence, previous job experience, and previous volunteer experience; 2) items pertaining to significant others - friends/connections, mentor, teacher, mother, father, spouse/partner; 3) items pertaining to environmental press - chance, affirmative action, placement service, course of least resistance. Again, Ironside (1981) purports examining both individual and environmental factors. She also investigated positive rather than negative factors:

> The very lack of women at the top in academic
> administration perpetuates the problem by setting
> subtle limitations on other's perceptions of what
> is possible and thus, worth striving for...it is
> this cycle which has suggested a study dealing with
> positive rather than negative factors; with what has
> enhanced women's careers rather than blocked them;
> with ambition fulfilled rather than thwarted...
> look beyond barriers to achievement by exploring
> the careers of women who are currently upper-level
> administrators...in hopes of providing useful
> information for helping others to realize their
> potential. (Ironside, 1981)

Other researchers have examined individual versus environmental or internal versus external variables pertaining to career achievement (Coffin & Ekstrom, 1979; Pillinger, 1971; and Mark, 1981).

Procedures

The 315 subjects were mailed the five page survey instrument in early May, 1983. Those subjects who did not respond within one month were sent a reminder postcard. Two hundred and fifty subjects returned the survey, a response rate of 80 percent. Of the completed surveys, 13 subjects were retired or no longer in administration, 24 were librarians who were excluded from the study due to lack of reliable status data, and 13 subjects were of a religious order. Mark (1982) found monastics to differ significantly from other male and female higher education administrators in regard to family and career orientation. The small number of monastic subjects did not justify examination in this study. A total of 200 completed surveys were analyzed.

Hypotheses to be Tested

The purpose of this study was to assess whether significant differences exist in scores on six factors relating to career achievement and position obtainment in women in higher education administration and level of status.

The following null hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of significance:

1. There will be no significant differences on the Career Achievement Factor pertaining to significant others score for subjects with different levels of status.

2. There will be no significant differences on the Career Achievement Factor pertaining to personal attributes score for subjects with different levels of status.

3. There will be no significant differences on the Career Barriers Factor score for subjects with different levels of status.

4. There will be no significant differences on the Position Obtainment Factor pertaining to personal attributes score for subjects with different levels of status.

5. There will be no significant differences on the Position Obtainment Factor pertaining to significant others score for subjects with different levels of status.

6. There will be no significant differences on the Position Obtainment Factor pertaining to environmental press score for subjects with different levels of status.

Design and Analysis

Subjects (n=200) were classified into three levels of status according to their position title and institution. Six one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were conducted to gain insight into the relationship between level of status and factors affecting career achievement of women in higher education administration. Levels of status were the independent variables. The six factors

of items relating to career achievement, career barriers and
position obtainment were the dependent variables. The research
design is presented in Figure 1.

Figure 1

Design for Analysis of Variance

	F^1	F^2	F^3	F^4	F^5	F^6
(low) S^1						
(middle) S^2						
(high) S^3						

S = Position status   F = Factors

S^1 = Low F^1 = Career Achievement - significant others

S^2 = Middle F^2 = Career Achievement - personal attributes

S^3 = High F^3 = Career Barriers

F^4 = Position Obtainment - personal attributes

F^5 = Position Obtainment - significant others

F^6 = Position Obtainment - environmental press

Means and standard deviations were collected on personal and educa-
tional data to facilitate the development of a subject profile.

Summary

Chapter III has outlined the methodological plan of the study.
Subjects were women administrators (n=200) in Kansas Higher Education

institutions. The subjects completed a survey, <u>Kansas Women in Higher Education Administration</u>. Subject's level of status was determined by raters according to position title and institution. The research design consisted of six separate one-way analyses of variance.

This study was designed to determine whether significant differences existed between factors affecting the career achievement and position obtainment of women in higher education administration and level of status.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to examine the differences in factors affecting career achievement and position obtainment for subjects with different position status. Status was assigned by raters according to position title and institution. Six career achievement and position obtainment factors were assessed by subjects' rating items on a one to five Likert scale as to degree of influence. Data were obtained from women administrators identified by the Kansas Planning Committee of the National Identification Program. All subjects were classified into one of three levels of status. Six one-way ANOVA's were performed, one for each of the six factors. Six main hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of statistical significance.

Table 2 represents the means and standard deviations for all groups. The results of the six one-way analyses of variance follow.

Career Achievement: Factor 1, Personal Attributes

The result of the one-way ANOVA with the sum of the ratings on personal attributes pertaining to career achievement as the dependent variable and the level of status as the independent

TABLE 2

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE SIX FACTORS

FOR HIGH, MIDDLE, AND LOW STATUS GROUPS

	F_1		F_2		F_3		F_4		F_5		F_6	
	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
High	38.90	5.86	14.90	10.99	24.57	16.96	17.67	4.66	5.67	14.77	4.29	8.89
Middle	38.11	6.09	11.39	15.46	10.99	33.02	16.19	6.00	.44	18.03	.73	10.60
Low	36.16	8.03	8.56	18.96	8.28	32.84	15.47	5.67	.26	17.52	1.07	11.20

variables yielded a F (2,201) = 1.81, p = .167   Table 3 reports

the source table for this analysis of variance. There was no

significant difference between level of status and score on career

achievement-personal attributes.

TABLE 3

SOURCE TABLE FOR CAREER ACHIEVEMENT:
FACTOR 1, PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES

Source	D.F.	SS	MS	F	Prob.
Between Groups	2	152.93	76.97	1.81	0.167
Within Groups	199	8479.04	42.61		
Total	201	8632.97			

Due to the unequal cell sizes, tests for homogeneity of

variance were conducted. Bartlett's Box F test for homogeneity of

variance showed that conditions of homogeneity of variance were met.

The null hypothesis of no significant difference between

level of status and career achievement pertaining to personal

attribute score was accepted (hypothesis 1).

Career Achievement: Factor 2, Significant Others

The result of the one-way ANOVA with the sum of the ratings

on the significant others pertaining to career achievement as the

dependent variable and the level of status as the independent

variables yielded a probability of F (2,201) = 1.17, p = .311.

Table 4 reports the source table for this analysis of variance.

TABLE 4

SOURCE TABLE FOR CAREER ACHIEVEMENT:
FACTOR 2, SIGNIFICANT OTHERS

Source	D.F.	SS	MS	F	Prob.
Between Groups	2	592.96	296.48	1.17	0.311
Within Groups	199	50245.28	252.49		
Total	201	50838.24			

There was no significant difference between level of status and score on career achievement pertaining to significant others.

Due to the unequal cell sizes, tests for homogeneity of variance were conducted. Bartlett's Box F tests for homogeneity of variance showed that conditions of homogeneity of variance were not met. Caution must be taken in the interpretation of data for this factor.

The null hypothesis for no significant difference between level of status and score on career achievement pertaining to significant others score was accepted (hypothesis 2).

Career Barriers: Factor 3

The result of the one-way ANOVA with the sum of the ratings on items pertaining to barriers to achievement as the dependent

variable and the level of status as the independent variable yielded a probability of F (2,201) = 2.01, p = .137. Table 5 reports the source table for this analysis of variance.

TABLE 5

SOURCE TABLE FOR CAREER BARRIERS:
FACTOR 3

Source	D.F.	SS	MS	F	Prob.
Between Groups	2	4049.82	20204.90	2.01	0.137
Within Groups	199	200431.75	1007.19		
Total	201	204481.57			

There was no significant difference between level of status and score on career barriers.

Due to the unequal cell sizes, tests for homogeneity of variance were conducted. Bartlett's Box F test for homogeneity of variance showed that conditions of homogeneity of variance were not met. Caution must be taken in the interpretation of data for this factor.

The null hypothesis for no significant difference on the career barriers factor score for subjects with different levels of status was accepted (hypothesis 3).

Position Obtainment: Factor 4, Personal Attributes

The results of the one-way ANOVA with the sum of the ratings
on the personal attributes pertaining to position obtainment as
the dependent variable and the level of status as the independent
variables yielded a probability of F $(2,201)$ = 1.01. p = .365.
Table 6 reports the source table for this analysis of variance.

TABLE 6

SOURCE TABLE FOR POSITION OBTAINMENT:
FACTOR 4, PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES

Source	D.F.	SS	MS	F	Prob.
Between Groups	2	68.39	34.19	1.01	0.365
Within Groups	199	6716.46	33.75		
Total	201	6784.85			

There was no significant difference between level of status and
score on personal attributes pertaining to position obtainment.

Due to unequal cell sizes, tests for homogeneity of variance
were conducted. Bartlett's Box F test for homogeneity of variance
were met for the position obtainment factor 4.

The null hypothesis for no significant differences on the
position obtainment factor pertaining to personal attributes was
accepted (hypothesis 4).

Position Obtainment: Factor 5, Significant Others

The results of the one-way ANOVA with the sum of the ratings on the significant others items pertaining to position obtainment as the dependent variable and the level of status as the independent variables yielded a probability of $F_{(2,201)} = 0.84$, $p = 0.432$. The source table for Factor 5's analysis of variance is reported in Table 7.

TABLE 7

SOURCE TABLE FOR POSITION OBTAINMENT:
FACTOR 5, SIGNIFICANT OTHERS

Source	D.F.	SS	MS	F	Prob.
Between Groups	2	523.51	261.76	0.84	0.432
Within Groups	100	61780.89	310.46		
Total	201	62304.40			

There was no significant difference between level of status and score on significant others relating to position obtainment.

Due to the unequal cell sizes, tests for homogeneity of variance were conducted. Bartlett's Box F test for homogeneity of variance were met for the position obtainment factor 5.

The null hypothesis for no significant differences on the position obtainment factor pertaining to significant others score for subjects with different levels of status was accepted (hypothesis 5).

Position Obtainment: Factor 6, External Press

The result of the one-way ANOVA with the sum of the ratings on the external press items pertaining to position obtainment as the dependent variable and the level of status as the independent variables yielded a probability of $F_{(2,201)} = 1.03$, $p = 0.358$. The source table for the factor analysis of factor 6 is reported in Table 8.

TABLE 8

SOURCE TABLE FOR POSITION OBTAINMENT:
FACTOR 6, EXTERNAL PRESS

Source	D.F.	SS	MS	F	Prob.
Between Groups	2	230.78	115.39	1.03	0.358
Within Groups	199	22236.16	111.74		
Total	201	22466.94			

There was no significant difference between level of status and score on external press items pertaining to position obtainment.

Due to the unequal cell sizes, tests for homogeneity of variance were conducted. Bartlett's Box F test for homogeneity of variance were met for the position obtainment factor 6.

The null hypothesis for no significant difference on the position obtainment factor pertaining to external press score for subjects with different levels of status was accepted (hypothesis 6).

Summary of Hypotheses Examined

The results of this study were presented in Chapter IV.

Hypothesis 1 related to status level and career achievement pertaining to personal attributes.

Hypothesis 2 related to status level and career achievement pertaining to significant others.

Hypothesis 3 related to status level and career barriers to achievement.

Hypothesis 4 related to status level and position obtainment pertaining to personal attributes.

Hypothesis 5 related to status level and position obtainment pertaining to significant others.

Hypothesis 6 related to status level and position obtainment pertaining to external press.

All six null hypotheses which stated that there would be no significant differences between level and status and Career Achievement factors, Career Barrier factor and Position Obtainment factors for the subjects were accepted. No significant differences were found.

Tests for homogeneity of variance were conducted due to unequal numbers in cells. They were not significant and conditions for homogeneity were met for all factors except factor 2, career achievement pertaining to significant others and factor 3, career barriers. Caution must be taken in the interpretation of data for factor 2 and factor 3 as tests for homogeneity of variance could not be met.

<u>Personal and Educational Data</u>

Results of the means on personal and educational data
collected are presented in Appendix II. Within status positions,
the most frequently held position in the low status group was
"Assistant Director," followed by "Assistant to the Dean," and
"Resident Hall Director." Those positions were held by 11, 4 and
4 subjects respectively. The most common area of administration
held by an "Assistant Director" in the low status group was in
admissions (n=4).

The most frequently held position title in the middle
status group was "Director" (n=64). The next two most commonly
held positions were "Department Chair" and "Associate Dean" (n=13).
The most popular administrative areas held by directors were:
Admissions and Records and Nursing; both areas held seven subjects.
The third most popular area was Public or University Relations
with six subjects holding director positions in this area. Of
the subjects reporting their academic area, the most commonly held
department chairs were in Nursing, History and Home Economics.
The Associate Deans did not as a whole report their administrative
areas.

The most common position title in the high status group was
"Dean." Of the twenty total subjects in the high status group,
eight were deans, three of these being Deans of Nursing. The next
most common position held in the high status group was Division
Chair. Three high status subjects were Division Chairs.

Summary

   Chapter IV presented the results of this study. All six
hypotheses were not accepted at the .05 level of significance.
Tests for homogeneity of variance were conducted because of the
unequal numbers in the cells. They were not significant and con-
ditions of homogeneity of variance were met for all factors except
for career achievement factor 2, significant others and career
barriers factor 3. Caution must be used in the interpretation of
the data for these two factors as tests for homogeneity of variance
could not be met. Data on personal and educational background was
presented for the three status level groups.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this study was to examine the differences between scores on factors perceived as affecting career achievement and position obtainment and position status of Kansas women administrators in higher education. Increasing numbers of women are entering academic administration and increasingly, women are taking top-level decision-making roles. Phenomena such as sex role socialization, role conflict and sex discrimination have been identified as barriers to the advancement of women in academic administration. In the past, such barriers were discouragers to any but the most outstanding, extraordinarily talented women. Little research has been conducted, however, which assesses the degree that these barriers have influenced women currently in all levels of administration. Little research has been conducted at different administrative levels to identify factors perceived as necessary for successful administration. Such information would be useful in defining more clear career paths to academic leadership. Also important is the examination of trends in leadership roles for women in higher education administration.

The literature reviewing the status of women administrators indicates a significant inequality between the number of men and

and women in academic administration. The percentage of women in administration increases in private institutions but does not become equal until examined at private women's colleges. As the level of position status increases, the number of women decrease. Research on barriers which limit the aspirations of women administrators center on sex role socialization, role conflict and sex discrimination. Sex discrimination's cumulative effects has prevented women from gaining necessary skills and experience (Terborg, 1977). However, many researchers have found that women report having experienced no discrimination (Montagu, 1974; Cochran, 1978; Ironside, 1981).

Factors identified as influencing the advancement of women administrators include: mentors, networks, internships and Affirmative Action. On the whole, mentors and networks have clearly been identified as positively affecting advancement (Tidball, 1976; Coffin & Ekstrom, 1979; Hennig & Jardim, 19 ; WEECN, 1980; Capek, 1981). The effectiveness of internships (Hochschild, 1975; Andre & Edwards, 1978; Kant & Wheatley, 1978) and the effectiveness of Affirmative Action (Marshall, 1975; Van Alstyne, 1977; Loeb, 1978; Kant & Wheatley, 1978; Kistler, 1979) is questionable.

Solutions to the inequality in academic administration outside of Affirmative Action have focused on increased efforts of the individual woman in the form of "survival strategies"; world economic change; or institutional commitments in the form of management training programs. This author favors the last solution

and proposes that specific factors pertaining to success perceived at all levels of administration need to be clarified for the development of such institutional plans.

This author found few studies that examined level of position status in relationship to factors affecting career achievement in women. Research has centered around specific positions, specifically, the chief executive officer. Mark (1980) examined administrative level in both men and women administrators to factors pertaining to self-orientation, family orientation and career orientation. She found that women displayed different patterns on scores of self-orientation between status levels than men.

Profiles of women administrators have produced contradictory findings. Reeves (1975); Palley (1978); Cochran (1976); and Moore (1982) found a majority of women administrators to be single. Pfiffner (1976) and Ironside (1981) report a majority of women administrators to be married. Most women administrators appear to be over 40 years old, have a Ph.D., have held their positions for not more than five years, and are not currently seeking a position. However, it must be noted that most of these data have been produced by examining only top level women administrators.

A striking finding in the research was the number of top level women administrators described as extraordinary, highly intelligent, and "generalists." They were highly talented in many areas. Also striking was the degree of change in administration over the last

ten years. This change takes the form of cultural and societal roles as well as actual skills performed in administrative positions.

In order to assess the differences between personal attributes and significant others pertaining to career achievement and level of status, items pertaining to these two factors were summed and a one-way ANOVA was conducted. Similar one-way ANOVA's were conducted on items pertaining to career barriers and level of status; items relating to personal attributes pertaining to position obtainment and level of status; and on items relating to significant others and items relating to external press pertaining to position obtainment and level of status.

Subjects were divided into status levels by an interrater reliability study based on position title and institutional affiliation. The hypotheses were tested at the .05 level of statistical significance to determine whether significant differences existed in scores on factors pertaining to career achievement, career barriers, position obtainment and status level.

No significant differences were found between any of the factors examined and status level. The findings indicate that there are no significant differences between high, middle and low status women administrators and the degree that they perceive these factors as affecting their career achievement and position obtainment. However, in all factors the women in the high status group perceived greater influences than both the middle and the low status

group. Also important, the standard deviations for the high level group were lower than the middle and low status group standard deviations for all factors. This indicates that the high status group perceived more factors contributing positively to their career achievement, more career barriers and more factors contributing to their present position obtainment and they are in more agreement as to the degree that these factors affected them than women in the low and middle status groups.

This trend is strongest in Factors 3 (Career Barriers) and 4 (Significant Others pertaining to Position Obtainment). One conclusion this author makes is that women of high status are indeed a more homogeneous group than other women administrators. They are dynamic, energetic, outstanding individuals; have used a wide variety of resources; and have overcome a great number of obstacles to success. The difference between low status level and high status level women administrators and the sum of career barriers perceived indicates that women of high status saw many more barriers in their climb up the ladder. However, this may be a function of amount of experience. The lower and middle status level women not having been in administration long enough to have experienced as many barriers. It could also indicate a trend in the amount of barriers for women in academic administration. The younger, lower level administrators actually did not have as many barriers as the older women administrators did when they entered

the profession. Caution must be taken in examining this factor as tests for homogeneity of variance were not met.

The difference between low status level and high status level women administrators and the degree that significant others affected their position obtainment indicates that top level women utilize contacts, mentors and family members for support and information to a greater extent. This finding is somewhat supported by the literature, in that the use of contacts is one of the most reported factors for success and that most of these studies were examining only top level women administrators.

Personal and Educational Data

The data on personal and educational backgrounds on the subjects profiles a typical Kansas woman administrator as forty years old, she has held her position just over five years, is affiliated with a large public institution, has a master's degree and plans on continuing her education towards a Ph.D. She has had at least one previous position at her current institution and more than likely, she has not held positions at other institutions. She is not likely to have risen through the faculty ranks, but if she did, she would have held the position of "instructor." She is not presently seeking a position, nor a promotion. Her family life finds her married, with two children, and her spouse being the larger wage earner.

Differences between women off high, middle and low status re-
garding personal and educational background are summarized below:

Age: high status women are older than middle and low status
       women by about eight years.

Institutitional
Affiliation: high status women are more likely to be employed
                in private institutions whereas low status women
                are more likely to be found in large public insti-
                tutions. This finding is congruent with previous
                research.

Degree held: high status women are more likely to have a Ph.D.
                and be involved in post-doctoral studies than mid-
                dle and low status women.

Number of
Positions
Previously   middle status women are more likely than high
Held: or low status women to have held a previous posi-
                tion at their current institution. High status
                women are more likely to have held a position at
                another institution than middle or low status
                women.

Faculty
Status: a greater number of high status women administrators
                had been or are currently members of the faculty.
                High status women are equally as likely to have been
                a chairperson as an instructor while middle status
                and low status women are most likely to have been
                instructors. Overall, a minority of women adminis-
                trators were members of the faculty. As administra-
                tive level decreased, the number of women experienced
                faculty members do so accordining. This suggests
                that faculty experience may be less important for
                today's administrators than in previous years. This
                finding is somewhat supported by the literature.

Position
Seeking: a greater percentage of low status women are seeking
                and not actively seeking new positions than middle or
                high status women. A greater majority of high status
                women are actively seeking a new position than middle
                status women, while a larger percentage of middle
                status women are not actively seeking positions than
                high status women.

Promotions: in all status levels, women administrators foresee
             better opportunities at other institutions than
             their current institution for promotion

Marital
Status: contrary to some of the literature, a far greater
             percentage of high status women are married and
             had children (three) than low or middle status
             women. Low status women were more likely to be
             single or divorced.

Wage
Earners: half of the married high status women are the
             larger wage earner in their household. They far
             outnumber the middle and low status group.

Results of the personal and educational data find differences be-

tween high, middle and low status women administrators in almost

every area. Marital status and number of children were the most

contradictory findings to the literature on women administrators.

Limitations

One of the major limitations of this study was the use of a

self-report survey which is subject to misinterpretation, faking

and response sets. Subjects' ratings of items important to their

achievement could be biased toward items which are currently of

popular interest, i.e., mentoring.

Subject return rate was acceptable, 80 percent. However,

some subjects were excluded from data analysis due to retirement,

lack of status data and religious affiliation, decreasing the per-

centage of total subjects analyzed to 64 percent. The sample was

not completely random. Women who had previously completed and

returned a "Personal Survey Form" were included (two-thirds of the

sample) and an additional 100 subjects were randomly selected. The women who had previously been in contact with the Kansas program may be more interested in advancement and may not be representative of the entire population of women administrators.

The homogeneity of the sample was another limitation. The study population, Kansas women administrators, cannot be assumed to be representative of higher education administrators in the U.S. Caution must be exercised in generalizing the findings beyond Kansas institutions of higher learning.

The sample size was small in both the high and low status levels. Due to the unequal cell sizes, homogeneity of variance was not met for two of the factors, Career Achievement pertaining to significant others (F2) and Career Barriers (F3). This reduces the confidence in the findings related to those factors.

The most important limitation in this study was the low interrater reliability coefficients in the assigning of status level to position titles. This reduces the confidence that three actual different groups based on status level were identified and compared. This author suggests that a more reliable method for determining status level be utilized, such as reported salary earnings, to differentiate the three groups.

Finally, the character and reward structures of universities may be different from private and community colleges. Opportunities for advancement may be different for the three institutional

types. The lumping together of administrators from all institu-
tions may have affected the results to an unknown extent.

Implications for Further Research

Studies need to be conducted which further investigate
differences between women at all status levels to factors which
affect their achievement in academic administration. There is a
need to develop instruments which identify factors most important
to achievement in academic administration and also which measure
the degree of influence such factors have on achievement.

Further research needs to be conducted concerning the nature
of role conflict and academic administration achievement. The
relationship of gender, sex role orientation, professional socializa-
tion and specific administrative skills needs further examination.

A better means of differentiating level of status, including
the examination of low versus entry level administrators, needs to
be developed.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to examine the differences
between status level of Kansas women administrators in higher
education and factors they reported as affecting their career
achievement and position obtainment.

There were no significant differences found between level of
status and scores on career achievement pertaining to personal
attributes; career achievement pertaining to significant others;

career barriers; position obtainment pertaining to personal attributes; position obtainment pertaining to significant others; and position obtainment pertaining to external press. However, subjects of high status consistently scored all factors high with a greater amount of agreement than both the middle or the low status group.

This finding may be a function of amount of experience, but this author suggests that upper level women administrators are a more homogeneous group of women who have outstanding abilities and talent and who have used every available resource to succeed in academic administration.

REFERENCES

References

Abramson, J. The invisible woman: discrimination in the academic
profession. San Francisco: Josey-Bass, 1975.

Adams, J. Women on top. New York: Hawthorne Books, 1979.

Alexander, S.W. Will power change? Newsweek, April 1, 1974, p. 30.

Alper, J. G. The relationship between role orientation and achieve-
ment motivation in college women. Journal of Personality,
1974, 42, (2), 9-31.

American Council On Education. Women Chief Executive Officers in Col-
leges and Universities. Office of Women in Higher Education
Annual Report, December, 1980.

Andre, R. & Edwards, M. I. Training women for administration. Jour-
nal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators
and Counselors, 1978, 42, (1) 12-18.

Ashburn, E. A. Motivation, personality, and work related character-
istics of women in male-dominated professions. Ruth Strong
Award Monograph Series No. 2. Washington, D.C.: National
Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors,
1977.

Astin, A. W. UCLA Educator, Spring, 1977, Reported in "On Campus
with Women", Project of the Status and Education of Women,
Association of American Colleges, October, 1977, 18, p. 1.

Astin, H. S. & Bayer, A. E. Sex discrimination in academe. Educa-
tional Record, Spring, 1972, 101-118.

Baumrind, D. From each according to her ability. School Review,
1972, 80, (2), 161-197.

Bem, S. L. & Bem, D. J. On liberating the female student. The
School Psychology Digest, 1973, 2, (3), 10-18.

Bennett, S. M. Minding our "p's" and "q's": notes for women in high-
er education administration. Women in Educational Administra-
tion: A Book of Readings, ed. Margaret C. Berry, Washington:
National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Couns-
elors, 1979.

Blaska, B. Women in academe - - the need for support groups. The
Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Adminis-
trators and Counselors, 1976, 39, 173-178.

Broverman, I. K., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., Rosenkrantz, P.
S., & Vogel, S. R. Sex role stereotypes and clinical judge-
ments of mental health. Journal of Counsulting and Clinical
Psychology, 1970, 34, (1), 1-7.

Cairns, K. V. Women and school administration. The Journal of Edu-
cational Thought, 1975, 9, (3), 165-175.

Capek, M. E. Careers and contacts: a study of networks and career
patterns in higher education. A paper presented at the Assoc-
iation for the Study of Higher Education, Washington, D.C.,
March 3, 1981.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Opportunities for women in
higher education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Chronicle of Higher Education.

Circincione-Coles, K. The administrator: male or female? Journal

of Teacher Education, 1975, 26, (4), 326-328.

Clement, J. P., DiBella, C. M., Ekstrom, R.B., & Tobias, S. No room
at the top? American Education, 1977, 13, (5), 20-26.

Cliff, J. Successful women administrators in higher education. Un-
published paper, University of Kansas, Fall, 1980.

Cochran, J. How do women administrators view job satisfaction and
discrimination? The Journal of the National Association of
Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, 1978, 14, (2),
67-68.

Coffin, G. C. & Ekstrom, R. B. Roadblocks to women's careers in Ed-
ucational administration. Women in educational administration:
a book of readings, ed, Margaret C. Berry, Washington D.C.:
National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Coun-
selors, 1979.

Cohen, S. L., Bunker, K. A., Burton, A.L. & McManus, P. D. Reactions
of male subordinates to the sex-role congruency of immediate
supervision. Sex Roles, 1978, 4, (2), 197-311.

Cohen, M. D. & March, J. Leadership and ambiguity: the american
college president. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

College and University Personnel Association. Women and minorities in
administration of higher education institutions. Employment
patterns and salary comparision 1978-79. Washington D.C.:
Author, 1981.

Crawford, A. L. Skills perceived to lead to success in higher educa-
tion administation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Uni-

sity of Alabama, 1982.

Dalton, G.W., Thompson, P., & Prics, R. L. The four stages of pro-
fessional coreers: a new look at performance by professionals.
Organizational Dynamics, 1977, 6, 19-42.

Damico, S. P. & Nevil, D. Education and role conflict: a woman's
dilemma. Educational Horizons, 1978, 56, (3), 140-143.

Deckard, B. The women's movement. New York: Harper and Row, 1975.

Dietsch, C. The sin of omission. American Secondary Education, 1978,
8, (2), 61-62.

Estler, S. E. Women as leaders in public education. Signs, 1978,
1, (2), 363-386.

Feather, N. T. & Raphelson, A. C. Fear of success in australian and
american student groups: motive or sex role stereotype? Jour-
nal of Personality, 1974, 42, (2), 190-201.

Feldman, S. A. & Kiesler, S. B. Those who are number two try harder:
The effect of sex on attributions of causality. Unpublished
paper. University of Kansas, 1973.

Fenn, M. Making it in management: a behavioral approach for women
executives. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1978.

Flammer, D. P. Self-esteem, parent identification and sex role dev-
elopment in preschool age boys and girls. Child Study Jour-
nal, 1971, 2, (1), 39-45.

Frasher, J., & Frasher, R. S. Educational administration: a feminine
profession. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1979, 15,
(2), 1-13.

Friends of Agricultural Education. _An early view of the land-grant colleges_. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1967.

Gappa, J. & Uehling, B. _Women in academe: steps to greater equality_. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, 1979.

Gordon, R. S. & Ball, P. G. Survival dynamics for women in educational administration. _The Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors_, 1977, _40_, (2), 46-48.

Graham, P. Women in academic life. In R. Knudson, ed., _Women and success: the anatomy of achievement_. New York: William Morrow, 1974, 238-247.

Gross, N. & Trask, A. E. _The sex factor and the management of schools_. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1976.

Hays, G. D. Strategies for advancing women in higher education administration. _Paper presented to Bryn Mawr/HERS Summer Institute_, July 1978, reprinted by Project on the Status of Education of Women, Association of American Colleges.

Hennig, M. & Jardim, A. _The managerial woman_. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1976.

Hochschild, A. R. Inside the clockwork of male careers. In F. Howe, ed., _Women and the power to change: a volume of essays sponsored by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education_, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975

Hoffman, L.W. Early childhood experiences and women's achievement

motive. The School Psychology Digest, 1973, 2, (3), 18-23.

Horner, M. Why bright women fail. Psychology Today, 1969, 3, (6).

Horner, M. Toward an understanding of achievement-related conflicts
in women. Journal of Social Issues, 1978, 28, 157-176.

Ironside, E. M. Uncommon women/common themes: career paths of up-
per level women administrators in higher education insti-
tutions. Paper presented at the Joint Conference of the
Southern Association for Institutional Research, Charlotte,
North Carolina, October 19 & 30, 1981.

Kane, J. N. Famous first facts. New York: H.W. Wilson, 1965.

Kanter, R. M. Men and women of the corporation. New York: Basic
Books, Inc., 1977.

Kanter, R. M. Wheatley, M. J. Career development women in aca-
cemic administration: the role of training (summary of re-
port to the carnegie corporation of New York). In Women
in Higher Education Administration, Project on the status
of women, September 1978.

Karabenick, S. A. & Marshall, J. M. Performance of females as
a function of fear of success, fear of failure, type of
opponent, and performance-contingent feedback. Journal
of Personality, 1974, 42, (2), 220-237.

Kistler, Kathleen, M. Equal opportunity: women in administration
in the california community colleges. December, 1979.
(ERIC Document Reporduction Service No. ED 217 896)

Larwood, L. & Wood, M. M. Women in management. Lexington, Mass:
D.C. Heath, 1971, 61-109.

Lasch, C. The culture of narcissim. New York: Norton & Co., 1978.

Lockhead, M. E. & Hall, K. P. Conceptualizing sex as a status
     characteristic: applications to leadership training strate-
     gies. The Journal of Social Issues, 1976, 32, (3), 111-124.

Loeb, J. The effectiveness of affirmative action for women. Jour-
     nal of Higher Education, 1978, 49, (3), 218-230.

Leviton, L.C. & Whitely, S.E. Job Seeking Patterns of Female and
     male Ph.D. Recipients. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1981,
     5, (5), 690-701.

Lynch, E. M. The Woman's guide to management: how to get to the top
     and stay there. New York: Cornerstone Library, 1978.

Lyson, T. The changing sex composition of college curricula: a
     shift-share approach. American Educational Research Journal,
     1981, 18, (4), 503-511.

MacConkey, D. F. Survival dynamics revisited: a reaction to twenty
     strategies. Women in educational administration: a book of
     readings, ed., Margaret C. Berry, Washinton D.C.: National
     Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors,
     1979.

McKee, J. P. & Sherriffs, A. C. The differential evaluation of
     males and females. Journal of Personality, 1957, 25, (3),
     356-371.

McKee, J. P. & Sherriffs, A. C. Men's and women's beliefs, ideals,
     and self-concepts. American Journal of Sociology, 1959, 64,
     (4), 356-363.

Mark, S. F. Leadership in higher education: consequences of career comittments. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association, Baltimore, MD: April 14-17, 1982.

Marshall, C. Career Socialization of women in school administration. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, 1979.

Marshall, C. Organizational policy and women's socialization in administration. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Research Association, Boston, 1980.

Marshall, C. Organizational policy and women's socialization in administration. Urban Education, 1981, 16, (2), 205-231.

Montagu, A. The natural superiority of women. New York: Collier Books, 1974.

Moore, K. M. Examining the Myths of administrative careers. American Association of Higher Education Bulletin, May, 1983.

Mosher, J. Masculinity and femininity. Conneticut Conference on the Status of Women: 51% Minority, NEA/USOE-0-72-2507, Storrs, Conneticut, 1972.

Newcomer, M. A Century of Higher Education for American Women. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1969,

Nieboer, N. There is a certain kind of woman... Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, 1975, 38, 99-103.

Office of Women in Higher Education. Annual report, Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, December, 1980.

Office of Women in Higher Education. Annual report, Washington, D. C.: American Council on Education, December, 1981.

Paddock, S. Careers in educational administration: are women the exception? Eugene, Oregon: Sex Equity in Educational Leadership Project, 1978.

Palley, M. L. Women as academic administrators in the age of affirmative action. The Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, 1978, 42, (1), 3-9.

Palmieri, P. & Shakeshaft, C. S. Up the front staircase: a proposal for women to achieve parity with men in the field of academic administration. The Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, 1976, 39, 58-65.

Parelius, A. D. Emerging sex-role attitudes, expectations and strains among college women. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1975, 37, 146-153.

Pfiffner, V. T. Composite profile of a top-level california community college woman administrator. The Journal of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, 1976, 40, 16-17.

Queralt, M. The role of the mentor in career development of university faculty members and academic administrators. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, Indianapolis, In-

diana, April 3, 1982.

Reeves, E. R.   An analysis of job satisfaction of women in admin-
istrators in higher education. The Journal of the National
Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors,
1975, 30, (3), 132-135.

Rosenkrantz, P.; Bee, H.; Vogel, S.; Broverman, I. & Broverman, D. M.
Sex role stereotypes and self concepts in college students.
Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32, (3),
287-295.

Sandler, B. R.   You've come a long way maybe--or why it still hurts
to be a woman in labor. Current Issues in Higher Education,
1979, (4), (Employment practices in academe).

Schmuck, D. A.   Deterrents to women's careers in school management.
Sex Roles, 1975, 1, (4), 339-353.

Schuman, P.   Sugar and spice... School Library Journal, 1971, 5,
(5), 117.

Soldwedel, B. J.   The profile and status of N.A.W.D.A.C. members,
1976. The Journal of the National Association of Women Deans,
Administrators and Councelors, 1977, 40, (4), 123-127.

Stockard, J.   Sex equity in educational leadership: an analysis of a
planned social change project. Newton, Mass: Educational
Development Center, 1981.

Swoboda, M. & Roberts, A. They came to learn, they came to teach,
they came to stay. University of Wisconsin System: Office
of Women, 1980.

Terborg, J. R. Women in management: a research review. Journal
in Applied Psychology, 1977, 62, (6), 647-664.

Thurston, A. J. A woman president? - a study of two year college
presidents. The Journal of the National Association of Women
Deans,Administrators and Counselors, 1975, 38, 118-123.

Tibbetts, S. L. Sex-role stereotyping: why women discriminate again-
st themselves. The Journal of the National Association of
Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, 1975, 38, (4),
177-183.

Tidball, M. E. Perspectives on academic women and affirmative ac-
tion. Educational Record, Spring, 1973, 130-135.

Tidball, M. E. Of men and research. Journal of Higher Education,
July/August, 1976, 373-389.

Tumpano, D. M. How to tell if you're discriminating against would-
be women administrators and what to do about it if you are.
American School Board Journal, 1976, 163, 19-23.

United States Department of Labor. Twenty facts on women workers.
Washington, D.C.: Author, 1979.

United States Department of Labor. Employment goals of the world
plan of action: development issues in the united states.
United States Country Paper, United Nations Mid-Decade Confer-
ence on Women, March, 1980

United States Department of Labor. Women & work. Washington, D.C.:
Office of Information, Publications and Reports, October/Nov-
ember, 1981.

United States Office of Education. The educational status of ameri-

can women: 1975-1988. <u>United States Country Paper, United Nations Mid-Decade Conference on Women</u>, March, 1980.

Van Alstyne, C.; Withers, J. S. & Elliot, S. A. Affirmative action: the bottom line tells the tale. <u>Change</u>, 1977, <u>9</u>, (8).

Women chief executive officers in colleges and univerities. <u>Comment</u>, June, 1980, <u>12</u>, (2).

Women's Educational Equity Communications Network. <u>Network News and Notes</u>, Winter, 1980, 1-3.

Widom, C. S. & Burke, B. W. Performance, attitudes and professional socialization of women in academia. <u>Sex Roles</u>, 1978, <u>4</u>, (4), 549-562.

<u>World Almanac</u>. New York: Newspaper Enterprise Association, Inc., 1977.

APPENDIX I:

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

KANSAS PLANNING COMMITTEE
of the
NATIONAL IDENTIFICATION PROGRAM FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF WOMEN IN HIGHER EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION
A Program of the Office of Women in Higher Education, American Council on Education

April 25, 1983

Dear Kansas Woman Administrator:

The National Identification Program is dedicated to the support
and progress of women in higher education administration. The
Kansas Planning Committee has selected you to be a participant
in a research project designed to better understand the needs and
diversities of women in Kansas Higher Education Administration.

The enclosed survey is designed to assess:

1. Your status in higher education administration.
    Status will be determined by your current career
    position and your development within your life
    cycle.

2. Factors which have positively effected your career
    achievement.

3. Barriers which you have faced while advancing with-
    in your career.

4. Factors which contributed to the obtainment of your
    present career position.

This survey should take no longer than 15-20 minutes to complete.
Please answer each question to the best of your knowledge. After
completion, please use the stamped, addressed return envelope.

Only a limited number of Kansas women administrators have been chosen
to participate in this study. If we do not receive your survey by
MAY 6th, we will personally contact you as reminder or to answer any
questions you may have delaying your survey's completion.

This information is confidential. Direct reference to you or your
institution will not be made. Only the aggregate information will
be used in the research and resultant reporting. Please feel free
to make comments throughout the survey. Questions may be directed
to: Jill Sundell, Graduate Assistant
     216 Strong Hall, Student Life
     University of Kansas
     Lawrence, KS 66045

Please answer every question.

Thank you for your time and support of women in Kansas Higher Education
Administration!

KANSAS WOMEN IN HIGHER EDUCATION ADMINISTRATION

You have been selected to participate in the Kansas Planning Committee's survey on women in Kansas Higher Education Administration. This survey is designed to assess and better understand the needs and diversities of women in Kansas Higher Education Administration.

This information will be utilized by the Kansas Planning Committee for future program development and will be incorporated into a Master's thesis by our staff assistant, Ms. Jill Sundell. Direct reference to you or your institution will not be made.

PART 1. Career Achievement

DIRECTIONS: Please rate the following factors on the degree that they have contributed _positively_ to your career ACHIEVEMENT. Keep in mind that you are rating these factors on how you believe they really effected your career achievement, not how they should have.

Place a star(*) next to _your single most important factor._

	low	med. low	med.	med. high	high	N/A
1. Personal Goal Setting	1	2	3	4	5	0
2. Previous Job Experiences	1	2	3	4	5	0
3. Volunteer Experiences	1	2	3	4	5	0
4. Personality	1	2	3	4	5	0
5. Professional Colleagues	1	2	3	4	5	0
6. Mentor	1	2	3	4	5	0
7. Spouse/Partner	1	2	3	4	5	0
8. Mother Role Model	1	2	3	4	5	0
9. Father Role Model	1	2	3	4	5	0
10. Sibling Role Model	1	2	3	4	5	0
11. Friends	1	2	3	4	5	0
12. Time Management Abilities	1	2	3	4	5	0
13. Staff & Personnel Management Abilities	1	2	3	4	5	0
14. Decision Making Skills	1	2	3	4	5	0
15. Financial Management Skills	1	2	3	4	5	0
16. Communication Skills	1	2	3	4	5	0
17. Honesty/Ethics/Integrity	1	2	3	4	5	0
18. Other (please list)	1	2	3	4	5	0

REMEMBER: Place a star(*) next to your SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR

Page 2   K.I.P. Survey   April, 1983

PART 2. Career Barriers

DIRECTIONS: Please rate the GREATEST BARRIERS to your career ACHIEVEMENT.
             Keep in mind that you are rating these factors on how you be-
             lieve they really effected your career achievement, not how
             they should have.

             Place a star(*) next to your most influential barrier.

	low	med. low	med.	med. high	high	N/A
1. Lack of Experience	1	2	3	4	5	0
2. Lack of Degree	1	2	3	4	5	0
3. Geographic Location	1	2	3	4	5	0
4. Lack of Contacts/Networks	1	2	3	4	5	0
5. Apathy	1	2	3	4	5	0
6. Discrimination/Sexism	1	2	3	4	5	0
7. Lack of Information	1	2	3	4	5	0
8. Social Class	1	2	3	4	5	0
9. Spouse's Occupation	1	2	3	4	5	0
10. Lack of Research Published	1	2	3	4	5	0
11. Lack of Role Models	1	2	3	4	5	0
12. Lack of Positions Available	1	2	3	4	5	0
13. Children	1	2	3	4	5	0
14. Partner	1	2	3	4	5	0
15. Lack of Communication Abilities	1	2	3	4	5	0
16. Lack of Personnel Management Abililities	1	2	3	4	5	0
17. Lack of Financial Management Abilities	1	2	3	4	5	0
18. Lack of Time Management Skills	1	2	3	4	5	0
19. Lack of Decision Making Skills	1	2	3	4	5	0
20. Other (please list)	1	2	3	4	5	0
21.	1	2	3	4	5	0

REMEMBER: Place a star(*) next to your SINGLE MOST INFLUENTIAL BARRIER

PART 3. Position Obtainment

DIRECTIONS: Please rate the following factors in the degree that they
             contributed in OBTAINING YOUR PRESENT POSITION. Keep in
             mind that you are rating these factors on how you believe
             they really contributed in obtaining your position, not
             how they should have.

             Place a star(*) next to your single most important factor.

		low	med. low	med.	med. high	high	N/A
1.	Friends/Connections	1	2	3	4	5	0
2.	Mentor	1	2	3	4	5	0
3.	Teacher	1	2	3	4	5	0
4.	Mother	1	2	3	4	5	0
5.	Father	1	2	3	4	5	0
6.	Skills/Abilities	1	2	3	4	5	0
7.	Reputation	1	2	3	4	5	0
8.	Self Diligence	1	2	3	4	5	0
9.	Chance	1	2	3	4	5	0
10.	Affirmative Action	1	2	3	4	5	0
11.	Graduate Degree Requirement	1	2	3	4	5	0
12.	Placement Service	1	2	3	4	5	0
13.	Previous Job Experience	1	2	3	4	5	0
14.	Spouse/Partner	1	2	3	4	5	0
15.	Course of Least Resistance	1	2	3	4	5	0
16.	Previous Volunteer Experience	1	2	3	4	5	0
17.	Other (please list)	1	2	3	4	5	0
18.		1	2	3	4	5	0
19.		1	2	3	4	5	0
20.		1	2	3	4	5	0

REMEMBER: Place a star(*) next to your SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT FACTOR.

Page 4 K.I.P. Survey April, 1983

Part 4. Self Comparison to Colleagues

DIRECTIONS: Please rate yourself in comparison to your FEMALE colleagues
on the following items. A colleague is a professional associate,
at your own or another institution.

	low	med. low	med.	med. high	high
1. Your professional reputation	1	2	3	4	5
2. Your interest in your own advancement	1	2	3	4	5
3. Your present career achievement	1	2	3	4	5
4. Your intelligence	1	2	3	4	5

DIRECTIONS: Please rate yourself in comparison to your MALE colleagues on
the following items. A colleague is a professional associate,
at your own or another institution.

	low	med. low	med.	med. high	high
1. Your professional reputation	1	2	3	4	5
2. Your interest in your own advancement	1	2	3	4	5
3. Your present career achievement	1	2	3	4	5
4. Your intelligence	1	2	3	4	5

Part 5. Personal Status and Educational Data

DIRECTIONS: Please indicate the correct response. Answer all questions.

1. Age: _____

2. Position Title: _____Years held: _____

3. Institutional setting: _____State University (15,000 and over)

_____State University (15,000 and under)

_____Private/Independent Institution   Size: ____

_____Community College   Size: ____

4. Educational degrees held:

type	Degree major	Institution	Date Received	Age Received
_____	_____	_____	____	____
_____	_____	_____	____	____

Page 5   K.I.P. Survey   April, 1983

Educational degrees held continued.,

type	Degree major	Institution	Date Received	Age Received
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

5. Previous positions held at present institution:

Title: _____ Years held: _____ Age: _____

Title: _____ Years held: _____ Age: _____

Title: _____ Years held: _____ Age: _____

6. Positions held at other institutions (please list three most recently held)

Position Title	Institution	Years Held	Age
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

7. Are you presently seeking a new position? YES-actively _____ NO _____

                                                Yes-not actively _____

8. Do you forsee a promotion in the future? At present institution YES _____

                                                                       NO _____

                                              At another institution YES _____

                                                                       NO _____

9. Are you presently actively seeking a promotion? YES _____ NO _____

10. Do you plan on continuing your education? YES _____ What Degree? _____

                                               NO _____

11. Marital status: Married _____ Separated _____ Divorced _____ Single _____

                    Widowed _____ Partnered _____

12. Your age at: Marriage _____ Divorce _____ Remarriage _____

13. Number of children_____ Your age at their births _____

14. Age of your children today: _____

15. Does your partner work: NO _____ YES _____ PART-TIME _____ NOT APPLICABLE _____

16. Who is the larger wage earner in your family: YOU _____ PARTNER _____ N/A _____

Page 6   K.I.P. Survey   April, 1983

Please return this survey in the enclosed, addressed, stamped envelope
by FRIDAY, MAY 6, 1983. Only a limited number of Kansas women adminis-
trators have been chosen to participate in this study. If we do not
receive your survey by FRIDAY, MAY 6, 1983, we will personally contact
you as reminder or to answer any questions you may have delaying your
survey's completion.

In the space below, feel free to make any comments about the survey or
women in higher education administration. Questions may be directed to:
Jill Sundell, Staff Assistant, Kansas Identification Program, 216 Strong
Hall, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045, 913/864-4060 or 841-2889.

THANK YOU for your support of women in Kansas Higher Education Administration!

**I would like to receive an abstract of the final document. Please send to:

Name: _____

Address: _____

         _____

         _____

APPENDIX II:

PERSONAL AND EDUCATIONAL DATA

MEAN AGE FOR HIGH, MIDDLE, AND

LOW STATUS GROUPS

Group	Age (X)
High	49.2
Middle	41.5
Low	38.9
Total Subjects	41.5

AVERAGE NUMBER OF YEARS HELD POSITION FOR

HIGH MIDDLE, AND LOW STATUS GROUPS

Group	Years Held Position ($\bar{X}$)
High	5.20
Middle	5.40
Low	4.90
Total Subjects	5.07

INSTITUTIONAL AFFILIATION FOR HIGH,

MIDDLE, AND LOW STATUS GROUPS

Group	Public (over 15,000)	Public (under 15,000)	Private (including municipal)	Community College
High	25.0%	10.0%	40.0%	25.0%
Middle	38.4%	10.2%	27.5%	23.9%
Low	51.2%	18.6%	23.2%	7.00%
Total Subjects	39.8%	11.9%	27.9%	20.4%

DEGREES HELD BY HIGH, MIDDLE,

AND LOW STATUS GROUPS

Group	None	Bachelor's	Master's	Ph.D.	Post Ph.D.	Other
High		19.0%	19.0%	52.5%	9.5%	-
Middle	2.2%	15.2%	47.8%	29.7%	.7%	4.4%
Low	4.7%	25.6%	58.1%	7.0%	-	4.6%
Total Subjects	2.5%	17.8%	47.0%	27.2%	1.5%	4.0%

PERCENT CONTINUING EDUCATION AND DEGREE SOUGHT

FOR HIGH, MIDDLE, AND LOW STATUS GROUPS

Group	Plan on Continuing Education (% yes)	Bachelor's	Degrees Sought		Post-Ph.D.	Other
			Master's	Ph.D.		
High	55.0%		15.0%	5.0%	35.0%	-
Middle	57.7%	.7%	12.4%	29.9%	8.8%	5.9%
Low	60.5%	4.7%	11.6%	16.3%	23.3%	4.6%
Total Subjects	58.0%	1.5%	12.5%	24.5%	14.5%	5.0%

NUMBER OF POSITIONS PREVIOUSLY HELD AT

CURRENT INSTITUTION BY HIGH,

MIDDLE, AND LOW STATUS GROUPS

| Group | None | One | Number of Positions | | Four | More than four |
			Two	Three		
High	35.0%	30.0%	5.0%	25.0%	-	5.0%
Middle	27.0%	33.6%	20.4%	17.5%	1.5%	-
Low	44.2%	27.9%	16.3%	11.6%	-	-
Total Subjects	31.5%	32.0%	18.0%	17.5%	1.0%	-

NUMBER OF POSITIONS PREVIOUSLY HELD AT

OTHER INSTITUTIONS BY HIGH,

MIDDLE, AND LOW STATUS GROUPS

Group	None	One	Number of Positions		Four	More than four
			Two	Three		
High	40.0%	10.0%	5.0%	40.0%	5.0%	-
Middle	42.3%	15.3%	23.4%	16.8%	2.2%	-
Low	48.8%	18.6%	9.3%	4.7%	18.6%	
Total Subjects	43.5%	15.5%	18.5%	16.5%	6.0%	-

PERCENTAGE OF HIGH, MIDDLE, AND LOW STATUS

GROUPS WHO HELD FACULTY POSITIONS

Group	Member of Faculty	% Assistant Instructors	% Instructors	% Assistant Professors	% Associate Professors	% Professors
High	62% (13)	0	30.8% (4)	15.3% (2)	7.7% (1)	7.7% (1)
Middle	45% (61)	1.6% (1)	34.4% (21)	18.0% (11)	16.4% (10)	9.8% (6)
Low	11% (5)	20.0% (1)	80.0% (4)	0	0	0
Total Subjects	40% (79)	2.5% (2)	36.7% (29)	16.5% (13)	13.9% (11)	8.9% (7)

Group	% Chairpersons	% Associate Deans of Academic Departments
High	30.8% (4)	7.7% (1)
Middle	16.4% (10)	3.4% (2)
Low	0	0
Total Subjects	17.7% (14)	3.8% (3)

PERCENTAGE OF HIGH, MIDDLE, AND LOW STATUS

GROUPS' SEEKING NEW POSITIONS

Group	% Actively Seeking	% Not Actively Seeking	% Not Seeking
High	15.0%	30.0%	55.0%
Middle	9.5%	39.5%	51.0%
Low	27.9%	46.5%	25.6%
Total Subjects	14.0%	40.0%	46.0%

PERCENTAGE OF HIGH, MIDDLE, AND LOW STATUS

GROUPS WHO ARE SEEKING A PROMOTION,

AND PERCENT WHO FORESEE A PROMOTION

Group	Seeking Promotion (% yes)	Foresee Promotion	
		At Present Institution (% yes)	At Other Institution (% yes)
High	15.0%	15.0%	40.0%
Middle	12.4%	19.1%	40.5%
Low	23.3%	16.3%	51.2%
Total Subjects	15.0%	18.1%	42.9%

MARITAL STATUS OF HIGH, MIDDLE, AND

LOW STATUS GROUPS

Group	% Married	% Single	% Divorced	% Other
High	75.0%	10.0%	10.0%	5.0%
Middle	55.5%	20.4%	14.6%	9.5%
Low	44.2%	30.2%	20.9%	4.7%
Total Subjects	55.0%	21.5%	15.5%	8.0%

NUMBER OF CHILDREN OF HIGH, MIDDLE, AND

LOW STATUS GROUPS

Group	None	One	Two	Three	Four	More than four
High	25.0%	10.0%	20.0%	35.0%	10.0%	-
Middle	38.0%	18.2%	26.3%	9.5%	5.1%	2.9%
Low	53.5%	16.3%	14.0%	14.0%	2.3%	
Total Subjects	40.0%	17.0%	23.0%	13.0%	5.0%	2.0%

LARGEST WAGE EARNER IN HIGH, MIDDLE,

AND LOW STATUS GROUP'S FAMILY

Group	Subject	Subject's Partner/Spouse	Same	Not Applicable
High	50.0%	20.0%	10.0%	20.0%
Middle	24.3%	33.8%	3.7%	38.2%
Low	18.6%	32.6%	-	44.2%
Total Subjects	25.6%	32.2%	3.5%	36.7%