Two steps forward, one step back? Strengthening the foundations of women's leadership in higher education

Lynne E. Ford

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

DIALOGUE: DIVERSITY IN THE DISCIPLINE

Two steps forward, one step back? Strengthening the foundations of women's leadership in higher education

Lynne E. Ford

Political Science, College of Charleston, Charleston, SC, USA

ABSTRACT
It has been 50 years since Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act ended legal employment discrimination on the basis of race and sex, and more than 40 years since Title IX prohibited sex-based discrimination in education. In the U.S., women earn more bachelors and advanced degrees than men and women are as likely as men to be employed. Yet, similar to business, law, and politics, highly visible women leaders in higher education remain the exception. This essay argues that overt bias, most easily addressed by policy and law, has been driven underground and replaced by a more subtle form of institutional discrimination expressed as normative institutional rules and practices. Drawing from research on gender equity and academic leadership, this paper argues that these obstacles to women's advancement will need to be exposed and redefined for everyone before women can enjoy benefits equally with men. In the interim, opportunities exist for women as individuals to be more proactive in acquiring leadership skills and experience. Similarly, institutions must be proactive in adopting strategies to accelerate the progress of women into top leadership positions while simultaneously advancing important structural and cultural changes.

Introduction

It has been 50 years since Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act ended legal employment discrimination on the basis of race and sex, and more than 40 years since Title IX prohibited sex-based discrimination in education. Today in the U.S. women earn more bachelors and advanced degrees than men, and women are as likely as men to be employed in the paid labor force. Two steps forward; yet, the steady advances of the previous four decades seem to have stalled well short of parity and equity goals. For example, in the U.S., fewer than 5% of CEOs of Fortune 500 and 1000 companies are women. Women hold only one-fifth of the available seats in Congress and in the state legislatures and make up one-third of the federal judiciary. Similar to business, law, and politics, highly visible women leaders in higher education remain the exception. Among college and university presidents, 26% are female (Lederman 2012). Although 44% of all full-time faculty members are women, only one-third are tenured or tenure-track. One-quarter of full professors are women

(Curtis 2013). Thirty-eight percent of provosts and 36% of academic deans are female. While women's representation on the faculty varies widely by discipline, women are most broadly overrepresented in the contingent faculty workforce. The wage gap for women in higher education remains significant – women on the whole make just 80% of men's salaries (Curtis 2013). Low representation of women among the highest ranks of the academy is not new; however, the slow advance of women in light of their growth in academe's primary labor pool is more puzzling (Bilen-Green, Froelich, and Jacobson 2008). One step back; what accounts for this plateau in progress? Why are so few women found among the highest positions of leadership across all types of institutions? Most importantly, how can we restore momentum to the equity imperative?

Descriptions of the problem are often appropriated as explanations – if only there were more women in the pipeline there would be more women at the top; the pipeline has leaks because women leave or are driven out of the workplace by family obligations; women's careers resemble a labyrinth rather than the traditional ladder acknowledged and rewarded; women are found in greater numbers at the bottom of the pyramid where jobs are more plentiful but more likely part-time with lower wages; the glass ceiling prevents the most talented women from reaching the top; and the sticky floor keeps the majority of women from ever aspiring to leadership. While there is a resonant truth in each of these descriptions, I argue that overt bias of the type most easily addressed in the past with equal opportunity policy and law has been driven underground and replaced by a more sophisticated form of discrimination expressed today in normative institutional rules. What appear to be gender neutral rules applicable to everyone are actually expressions of the gendered university – a place in which the terms of hire, tenure and promotion, salary negotiation, and advancement to leadership positions are based on an anachronistic male breadwinner model. Women are systematically disadvantaged in this male-normed environment because they present a different lived experience. Though assumed to be essential attributes of an academic career, in fact these normative institutional rules and practices are social constructions that can and must be changed (Bailyn 2003). Elsewhere in this symposium McClain et al. (2016) and Smooth (2016) analyze how race has shaped the experience of scholars, particularly those who study race or who are women of color in political science. In this essay, I address how the hierarchy of higher learning institutions is gendered, drawing on my experience as a white woman and full professor of political science who has served in administrative positions at a top ranking, public, independent college in the South. My analysis and recommendations, while not limited to white women faculty in colleges of the South, are informed by my lived experience; they may not therefore be generalizable to all women faculty. Nonetheless, I believe what follows can inform many women faculty who face dilemmas rooted in gender stereotypes and women's substantial caretaking responsibilities.

Drawing from research on gender equity and academic leadership, I argue that women's advancement will require significant structural changes to the career ladder of academe, changes that apply to men and women. In other words, the terms of an academic career must be reformed taking into account the empirical realities of the modern workplace where women and men are employed full-time. The entire career trajectory must be re-imagined around essential human needs rather than essentialist models of the gendered workplace where every full-time worker is assumed to have a full-time caregiver at home. Similarly, universities need to critically examine the division of academic labor following

tenure for men and women, ensuring that everyone shares in the teaching, advising, and service duties so that both women and men can continue to pursue research and scholarship that results in timely promotion to full professor. Promotion serves as the gateway to advancing positions within academic leadership. Transforming institutional cultures is difficult, but, as learning-centered organizations, universities should take the lead in reflecting on practices that reify timeworn gender norms. Simultaneously, women must pursue individual-level strategies to position themselves well within existing structures even as they participate in the change process. In particular, women can pursue three strategies – social efficacy, social modeling, and mentoring – to acquire the requisite leadership skills and experience that will enable them to claim positions of influence in departments and universities where they can act as transformational change agents.

The effects of a gendered economy on university leaders

One of the most significant structural obstacles to advancing women's leadership remains the gendered nature of the academy itself, which favors masculine traits and ignores the necessity of domestic labor. Gender stratification is a stable feature in colleges and universities (Battle and Doswell 2004). Similar to politics and business, academia is a highly masculinized work environment situated squarely in the public domain: "Founded by men for men, the academic world propagates career architectures and rewards behaviors that are masculine in nature and origin, suited to the men who once exclusively pursued them" (Dean 2009, 240). Gender inequities in the modern workplace are rooted in the historic separation of spheres: the masculine sphere of paid work and the feminine sphere of unpaid domestic life. The empirical reality of large numbers of women in the workforce has done little to force the integration of public and private spheres. In 63% of families with children between the ages of 6 and 17, both parents were employed and women contributed over 37% of their families' incomes (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics 2015). Across all economic and occupational sectors, women made up 57% of the paid labor force in 2014.

Evidence of the public–private dissonance is most visible in the pernicious images of what constitutes a good worker and academia is not immune. As Williams (2003, 2005) observes, the "ideal worker" is someone whose commitment to work (time) is unlimited, who can move at will (or seek outside offers for salary reasons), and needs no time off for childbearing, child-rearing, or elder care. Since academics average longer hours than most professionals, they may be especially susceptible to this demand for devotion to work (Damaske et al. 2014). When academic work is governed by these gendered institutional norms and practices, women are at a distinct disadvantage. "Merely allowing women faculty to meet the criteria for academic success, on terms that have been defined for men and represent their life experiences, does not necessarily guarantee equity" (Bailyn 2003, 140). Seventy percent of women in dual-earner couples report taking greater responsibility for routine childcare than their male partners (New America Foundation 2004). The American Psychological Association (2013) estimates the percentage of informal family caregivers who are women at between 59% and 75%. University policies enabling women and men to stop the tenure clock or to allow part-time tenure tracks are intended to allow tenure-track faculty members to delay their tenure review for a variety of reasons likely to negatively affect their research productivity (Manchester, Leslie, and Kramer

2013). But, since these policies do not substantially alter the underlying expectations for promotion and tenure, they tend to be underutilized (Bailyn 2003). Although such policies have existed for nearly 40 years and are now widely available across institutional types, they are often interpreted as perks for individuals rather than a social or institutional imperative to meet basic human needs. Thus, the institutional norms associated with achieving tenure and the requisite timetable remains unchanged. Santos and Cabral-Cardoso (2008) argue that until a sense of entitlement among men and women develops around policies that disrupt the status quo, universities will resist transformation. What little research there is on the impact of such policies is mixed – junior faculty who stop the clock win tenure as often as those who do not, even though men and women alike fear that they will be evaluated more harshly by senior colleagues and judged less committed to their careers as a result of exercising family-friendly policies (Manchester, Leslie, and Kramer 2013). Holding research productivity constant, Manchester, Leslie, and Kramer (2013) found as much as a 3.1% salary penalty in the first year following a stopped clock, with men suffering the greatest salary consequence.

Further evidence of academe's stubborn adherence to traditional gendered norms comes from a study of male scientists. Damaske and her colleagues (2014) examined the extent to which changing norms of fatherhood and a flexible workplace affected men working in the highly male-dominated professions of biology and physics. Employing a typology based on the men's approach to navigating the work–family conflict, roughly one-third of the sample could be categorized as "egalitarian partners" and another third as "traditional breadwinners." Others responded to changing norms by deciding to forgo children altogether or by adopting a neo-traditional approach wherein both partners work but the husband is less responsible for work in the home than his female partner. Although the proportion of egalitarian partners and their norm-challenging strategies suggest progress, Damaske et al. conclude:

> The traditional men at the top continue to have significant power in the university system, and their expectations about the division of labor at home are likely a deterrent to both female scientists and egalitarian-minded male scientists. This may mean that younger traditional male scientists may be more likely to advance their careers within the current structure, suggesting that change may be slow in coming. (2014, 25)

In other words, those most likely to perpetuate a separate spheres ideology occupy positions of authority that enable them to replicate the status quo by mentoring younger cohorts of neo-traditional and traditional men and by continuing to play key roles in hiring and promotion decisions. Although this study was limited to natural science, a multitude of male-dominated disciplines remain, including political science. Supporting the depiction of the profession as male-dominated is the APSA Task Force's finding (2011, 41) that as of 2010 men constituted 71.4% of political science faculty in the U.S. (also see Mershon and Walsh 2016).

Thus, a key institutional-level obstacle to gender equality in the academy remains the unexamined, self-replicating nature of key institutional processes – hiring, tenure, and promotion – that reinforce the gendered university. By implicitly perpetuating the falsehood that all workers have a caretaking support system at home, the gendered university rewards faculty who perform according to traditional male gender norms. Under this system, both men and women are disadvantaged, but particularly women.

The effects of the gendered university economy on its leaders

The traditional path to academic leadership is through the professoriate. Success as an assistant professor leads to tenure and promotion to associate professor. Continued success leads ultimately to full professor. Once tenured, faculty may choose to continue with a career oriented around teaching, research, and service or to pursue an administrative leadership path. The internal path to a presidency typically includes time as a department chair, an academic deanship, and experience as a provost. The linear and somewhat singular nature of the internal path to academic leadership requires an individual to demonstrate effective leadership in each of the varied roles, even though very little of what is required to achieve tenure success as a faculty member translates to effective preparation for broader institutional leadership. Women must fill the pipeline at every stage but, as the statistics demonstrate, the attrition rates for women from associate to full professor foreshadow their low numbers in future institutional leadership applicant pools.

A 2006 report of the Modern Language Association's Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession, "Standing Still: The Associate Professor Survey," found that female associate professors in the association were less likely to be promoted than their male counterparts, and it took women from one to three and a half years longer than men to advance to full professorships, with women at doctoral universities lagging farthest behind. Misra and her colleagues (2011) found that disproportionate time spent in teaching and service was a significant obstacle for women associate professors to attaining full professor rank, a pattern that appears to be an informal gender norm. At one research university, their survey found dramatic differences among associate professors by sex. Although associate professors of both sexes worked similar amounts of time overall – about sixty-four hours a week – the distribution of work time varied considerably. Men spent seven and a half hours more a week on their research than did women; women associate professors taught an hour more each week than men, mentored an additional two hours a week, and spent nearly five hours more a week on service (Misra et al. 2011, 24). Nationally, these patterns are too prevalent across time, university type, and discipline to attribute to individual "choices." More likely they reflect a lingering belief that women are "naturally" more disposed toward teaching and service.[1] One respondent in an Irish study of perceptions of male and female leadership in higher education went so far as to characterize teaching as "the new housework" (Grove 2013).

University of Pennsylvania education researcher Laura Perna's analysis of National Study of Postsecondary Faculty data reveals that, nationwide, women at four-year colleges and universities are 10% less likely than men to attain promotion to full professor, even after controlling for productivity (career-refereed publications), educational background, institution type, race, ethnicity, and nationality (2001). Perna's findings suggest that gender differences cannot simply be attributed to men being more productive researchers or having more experience than women. Instead, they point to entrenched institutional practices, such as the "ideal worker" norm, that continue to disadvantage many women even after tenure. The underlying problem is that of "the gendered organization, whereby work policies, interpersonal networks, and embedded attitudes have evolved from the life experiences of the traditional male bread-winner, creating an unequal playing field favoring the advancement of men" (Bilen-Green, Froelich, and Jacobson 2008, 2). Women must work harder to be visible in the gendered university; transforming

the gendered university will require disrupting the academic division of labor and rewards system, such that men and women are expected to share equally the tasks related to teaching and service so that time remains for scholarship. As universities compete for students by promoting close relationships with faculty, the time dedicated to teaching, advising, and mentoring must be acknowledged in the faculty reward system. However, as long as gendered organizations and the normative institutional rules and practices persist in ways that disadvantage women, aspiring women leaders will need individual advancement strategies distinct from those of their male colleagues.

Developing women's leadership and its effects on universities

What is the most effective way to develop women as academic leaders given the considerable constraints? Several themes worth discussing emerge from the literature on leadership in higher education and nearly all of them focus attention at the individual rather than institutional level. There are primarily three areas of emphasis among the many strategies to assist women in overcoming the barriers inherent in gendered organizations: development of self-efficacy, social modeling, and mentoring. Universities that facilitate women's promotion and leadership by encouraging these strategies not only aid ambitious women, however, they also may transform themselves.

Self-efficacy

Scholars identify self-efficacy as a "viable on-ramp" for women as they aspire to academic leadership positions (Ely and Meyerson 2000; Sloma-Williams et al. 2009). Research linking self-efficacy to career development is most often grounded in Bandura's (1997) theoretical framework. Self-efficacy is the belief in one's own capabilities to organize and execute the sources of action required to manage prospective situations. "Underlying many of the behaviors helpful for leadership positions, it functions as a major predictor of goal-setting behavior, the degree of effort devoted to a specific task, and actual task performance" (Sloma-Williams et al. 2009, 52). Singer (1991) found that the higher a woman's self-efficacy, the more likely she was to aspire to a leadership position. Self-efficacy differs from self-confidence in important ways. Self-efficacy refers to believing in one's sense of agency – believing that one's ability can produce specific and desired results – while confidence functions as a more generalized appreciation of one's own abilities. It is possible that when considering leadership traits, confidence in men is understood presumptively as self-efficacy. Evidence comes from a surprising source: transgender men. Female to male transgender individuals in the same occupation (and often in the same position) report being taken more seriously, being given greater levels of responsibility, and receiving positive feedback for traits that were previously negatively labeled "aggressive" when they lived as a female (Schilt 2011). In similar ways, gender norms prevent women from bragging about their own accomplishments, whereas men are not limited by modesty norms (Smith and Huntoon 2013). Dean, Bracken, and Allen (2009) champion the power of personal agency as:

> individuals accepting the responsibility and claiming the authority to be the means through which they accomplish their desired goals. Personal agency involves the individual capacity to act independently and make free choices and the responsibility to do so. This necessitates ability, intentionality, authority, and accountability. (4)

Self-efficacy can be cultivated through mastery experiences and social modeling. Within the realm of academic leadership, opportunities for mastery experiences come most directly through faculty roles in service to the institution or to the profession. This presents women with a dilemma of sorts; a large service commitment has been found to delay promotion and limit time for research, as noted above. Yet, campus-based service offers women the opportunity to lead effectively outside the constraints of a limiting department culture and to attract the attention of leaders in the administration. This means that women must be strategic in selecting opportunities that align with their existing skillset so that they can be successful enough to be invited to chair a committee or two, but offer the chance to test the boundaries of their capacities so that they can learn and demonstrate the ability to grow into other positions of leadership. A 2002 Johns Hopkins University Committee on the Status of Women identified the chair or division director as the critical opportunity for individuals and as a catalyst for institutional change for three reasons. First, the chair remains within the discipline and being selected for the position enhances a woman's credibility as a scholarly leader within her field. Second, being a department chair provides a basis for developing skills and credentials in administration – necessary preparation for more senior leadership roles. Finally, being a department chair increases a faculty member's visibility as a leader, internally and externally, and offers women the opportunity to provide mentorship and to serve as role models to others (Dominici, Fried, and Zeger 2009). Serving as role models and mentors often generates direct feedback from others about a faculty member's leadership that reinforces self-efficacy. By inviting and encouraging women to accept leadership roles to enhance their self-efficacy, chairs thus empower individual women; they also foster institutional change by promoting social modeling.

Social modeling

Social modeling can occur through the presence of role models and mentoring, as senior women in particular inspire others to believe that women's leadership is possible. I focus here on role models and discuss mentoring in the following section. A 2008 study based on 221 doctoral-granting institutions in the U.S. tested the proposition that women in senior academic leadership positions can facilitate institutional change and improve recruitment, retention, and advancement of women within the professorial ranks (Bilen-Green, Froelich, and Jacobson 2008). The results are encouraging, but not definitive. Descriptively, they confirmed that the proportion of women in the top administrative ranks is comparable to the percentage of women in the professorial ranks, but they are not able to sort precursors from results: do more women administrators lead to more tenured women or vice versa? Yet "having more women in formal leadership positions actually models the desired culture change in a conspicuous and powerful way, while opening valuable networking opportunities for both women and men to experience a new outlook" (4). Rather than adding more women at the front end and encouraging them through the career maze, more significant progress in advancing women can be made by adopting a proactive approach that places senior women in academic leadership positions, speeding the progress of women as full participants at all levels of the university.

Although one such strategy is to give preference to women in hiring for senior leadership positions, another is to be certain that hiring panels are trained in and committed to

promoting senior women so that social modeling can occur. University leaders who aspire to advance women in leadership positions will thus find themselves enhancing institutional transformation, as hiring and promoting women requires that university committees grapple with bias. If a search firm is employed, the hiring panel should ensure that the firm's record includes success in identifying female candidates and a robust record of progressive advancement for senior women leaders. This is particularly critical in light of recent research on hidden gender bias when identifying leaders (Mo 2012). The Implicit Association Test (IAT) provides a set of measures designed by psychologists to tap into hidden biases by testing how quickly a person can pair two concepts. Cecilia Mo and colleagues used the IAT to test for gender bias in picking political leaders. Respondents consistently paired words like president, governor, and executive with male names and words like secretary, assistant, and aide with women's names. Within the political context, those respondents most biased against women leaders on the IAT were 12% more likely to vote for a male candidate over an equally qualified female candidate. Mo concludes that there is "a gulf between our conscious ideals of equality and our unconscious tendency to discriminate at the ballot box" (Mo 2012). A similar dynamic could easily screen out highly qualified females in senior searches, particularly for provost and president.

In the absence of visible female role models on campus, there are several institutes and professional development opportunities targeted at enhancing leadership skills for women in higher education at the chair's level and above that can enable women who attain leadership roles to be prepared and successfully perform social modeling (e.g., American Council on Education's Inclusive Excellence National Women's Leadership Forum, Spellman College's Women of Color Leadership Conference, and HERS: Higher Education Resource Services). The efficacy of these training programs designed to cultivate women leaders in higher education has not been the subject of much research to date. However, HERS will mark its fortieth anniversary by launching a research agenda that includes investigating women's slow advancement to the presidency of colleges and universities in anticipation of a decade of expected openings created by retirements. In addition, HERS is collaborating with the Center for Creative Leadership and the University of Colorado to conduct research on the career paths of senior women leaders to identify the factors that facilitated, deterred, or derailed progress toward leadership goals (White 2013). Universities that underwrite women faculty's participation in programs like these, or that establish similar programs themselves, provide the groundwork for future transformation.

Mentoring

Finally, mentoring occupies a prominent place in the research literature. Mentoring is one of a cluster of professional assets that have been found to accelerate promotion, with both professional and psychosocial benefits accruing to the mentee. Mentoring implies an active relationship in which the mentor makes a personal investment in the success of the mentee. Mentors professionally socialize mentees in the norms and customs of the organization, share wisdom and lessons of experience, provide encouragement and critical feedback, and often facilitate the mentee's career by providing appropriate opportunities to take on leadership roles or encourage career progression in other ways. Mentors introduce mentees to influential networks of information providers and opportunity-makers

and teach mentees how to identify appropriate professional networks for themselves in the future.

Kanter (1977) argued that women require mentoring more so than men to overcome the inequities and unequal opportunities within gendered organizations. When organizational structures are not equally permeable for everyone, people and networks become critical conduits for career progression. Since many mentoring relationships begin when the prospective mentor identifies with his or her mentee, it is particularly problematic that mentors often overlook those who are unlike themselves, intentionally or unintentionally perpetuating the "old boys' network." Whether because of a small number of available senior women or because of limited access to networks where mentors can be found, women must work harder than men to initiate a mentoring relationship. This shortage in senior women is an incentive for university leaders investing in junior women to hire women across all ranks, as senior women are critical for their success. It also is a reason for universities to invest in diversity training for privileged men, so that they might become positive mentors, given the dearth of senior women in disciplines like political science.

A study of 657 women Chief Academic Officers (provosts) at U.S. colleges and universities confirms the positive role of mentors (Dean 2009). A majority of women provosts had a mentor at some point in their career (82%) and many were still being actively mentored (47%). Women perceived their mentors as incredible professional assets –resources, guides, and role models who supported and facilitated their professional development and advancement opportunities. The relationships exhibited caring, loyalty, and constant encouragement – a powerful combination. Yet the research also demonstrated that these powerful relationships are most likely to develop within institutions that create mentoring cultures through support, resources, and positive rewards, a culture that is advantageous for all faculty. Further, mentoring drops off as women age and advance to higher positions within the institution. There are few studies on the efficacy of mentors for senior women interested in a presidency, for example. If one goal is to promote more women to provost and president, consistent mentoring along the career ladder warrants attention by all institutions that aim to place women in leadership positions. Although fewer than half of higher education institutions in the U.S. have internal leadership development programs for women and people of color, opportunities exist elsewhere through national professional development programs that these institutions might emulate or support. Once again, if university leaders aim to advance individual women they might find themselves underwriting training that can serve as a foundation for broader transformation by providing cohorts of underrepresented groups with essential skills for advancement. In sum, all of the accumulated evidence suggests that mentoring works to promote individuals – for those at the beginning of their careers (Blau et al. 2010) and those at the senior level of academic leadership (Bornstein 2009).

The benefits of mentoring extend to developing early career expectations and exercising "intentionality" in constructing a career path. In a study of community college presidents, Eddy (2009) found that all of the men but none of the women intentionally planned to ascend to a presidency. As one woman in the study noted,

It wasn't something that I felt strongly about. I mean, I was considering it and I guess I kept thinking what harm would it do to apply for this position here and what harm would it do to

pursue the next step. It was kind of like, well, I'd take one step and see if that felt okay and then take the next step. (Eddy 2009, 20)

Men, on the other hand, actively sought their presidencies through encouragement of mentors, through a series of promotions over time, and with an intentionality that was lacking in the female participants. "Men operated with an assumed right to the position and an unquestioned link between their gender and the position" (Eddy 2009, 21). Curtailed career expectations are not limited to the U.S. Nicola Dandridge, chief executive of Universities UK, says, "I'm struck by how many women academics want to stay as academics and not move into management and administration, referring to the ghastly hours that being a vice chancellor requires and decide that that is not for them" (Anyangwe 2011). Universities intent on advancing individual women thus may not only need to address the gendered university economy but also the "ideal worker" norm to provide the structural conditions for women's interest and success in these positions.

Women are more likely than men to succeed in applications for senior leadership positions in the U.K., but women do not apply in the same numbers as men (Anyangwe 2011). At an earlier stage in the academic career, one of the main risks predicting women's exit from higher education prior to achieving tenure is a lack of well-developed career expectations that may be rooted in gendered norms and the sexual division of labor. The implication is that for women to advance to positions of academic leadership there must be more individual intentionality in constructing a viable path within the organization, and that universities must acknowledge and overcome the obstacles presented by gender. Sheryl Sandberg's admonition, "Don't leave before you leave," has relevance here. It may be that as a woman learns more about the various leadership roles within the institution, some will be of more interest than others; but women with skill and talent should always work and plan as if one day they will lead an institution either as a provost or president. This strategy is of course insufficient, as men benefit from the gendered university economy and the gendered economy more broadly. Bias training, search firms with a proven track record hiring women, leadership training for underrepresented groups, and mentoring and mentoring training cannot overturn prejudicial economies. Nonetheless, they can empower women and other underrepresented groups to spur and lead this quest for change.

Changing the rules and informal norms to disrupt gendered leadership

In this section, I discuss two institutional rule changes and the adoption of one informal norm to disrupt the gendered leadership of the academy. A 6-year American Council of Education Project on Leadership and Institutional Transformation based on 23 colleges and universities discovered that transforming institutions entails three requirements: senior leadership engagement, willingness to take concrete action, and commitment to collaborative practices (Eckel and Kezar 2003). Building especially on the latter requirement, Chun and Evans argue that transforming the demography of academic leadership will require a shift from "the dominant authority-based administrative paradigm to one that focuses upon collaboration and empowerment" (2012, 7). Citing the American Association of Colleges and Universities initiative "Making Excellence Inclusive" as a viable framework for institutions, Chun and Evans emphasize the need for institutions to link inclusion with the fundamental purposes of higher education – empowerment. Structural change of this

magnitude may require a new mission statement, the appointment of women and minorities to administrative positions that report directly to the president, and a top to bottom review of institutional hiring processes (Battle and Doswell 2004).

Hiring committees will also need to take concrete action by carefully monitoring bias toward candidates from certain disciplines in leadership hires. In answer to the "why so few" question, Garrett's analysis identifies a pronounced bias toward scholars from certain disciplines in leadership hires (2015). More specifically, she finds that Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) disciplines are most highly represented among presidents and vice chancellors at the most highly ranked universities. There were no leaders from the arts at universities on the World Top 20 or among the top 50 in the US News & World Report. "Within STEM fields, there is a disproportionate number of engineers, while the social scientists are mainly economists and the humanists are nearly all philosophers." Garrett is careful to point out that today's university presidents and provosts received their Ph.Ds. between the late 1970s and early 1990s when there was a more serious gender imbalance than there is today. However, the proportion of women earning advanced degrees in Engineering was barely over 20% in 2012 meaning that we are unlikely to have equitable pools of male and female candidates in the next 50 years if this bias continues – "the discipline bias alone will prevent gender parity" in the availability of qualified female candidates for leadership positions.

Rowe (1989) details the one-to-one approach to transforming an institutional culture. Attractive for its simplicity, this approach explicitly links institutional transformation to individual actions within a broad strategy articulated and modeled by the university's leadership structure. Rather than rely on institutional policy changes to transform culture, Rowe's approach places change in the hands of each individual and relies on the development of personal relationships developed within departments and schools to eliminate bias in hiring, for example. Each member of the department or hiring committee is expected to recruit one diverse colleague for an open position. Rowe writes, "The hallmark of the successful top administrator is joint 'problem-solving' *with* minority women and men and majority women" (377). University presidents, deans, and department leaders must decide to personally make a difference in recruiting, mentoring, and nurturing naturally occurring networks of underrepresented populations on campus. One myth in this regard is that external, open competition for leadership positions enhances the chance of a woman being hired. The 2004 Report of the University Committee on the Status of Women at Johns Hopkins explicitly recommended that university leaders actively and intentionally recruit and promote women from within the university when executive and senior administrative leadership positions become available. More specifically, the report called on search committees to tap women directors of departments and divisions, centers, and institutes since in those roles individuals would have developed strong qualifications for executive leadership. Such a strategy disrupts the widespread institutional practice of looking outside for new leadership and advantages both men and women less able or willing to relocate. In fact, internal-only recruitment processes were nearly twice as likely to result in a woman being appointed in the U.K. By way of explanation, researchers found that a desire to find the "best candidates" drove hiring committees to choose applicants with the most experience, thus bypassing talented but less experienced female candidates (cited in Shepherd 2015).

> For too long higher education has clung to the reassuring belief that it is a meritocratic environment, in which the best person always gets the job. But, the perpetuation of a male-dominated executive management in the face of the rising number of female academics – many of them in management roles – makes this claim untenable. (Shepherd 2015)

Surely the skills and qualities required to lead universities cannot be so disproportionately distributed in favor of male candidates.

Conclusion

The gendered university concept helps explain the stalled momentum in the equity imperative to advance women's leadership in higher education. Familiar interventions such as mentoring for women, equal opportunity laws and policies, and affirmative action recruitment and hiring strategies have not been enough. Individuals and institutions must partner in taking responsibility for the demographics of senior leadership. Borrowing from Sheryl Sandberg's (2013) call to women to *lean in* to their careers, Ward and Eddy (2013) call on institutions likewise to *lean forward* in creating workplaces where both men and women can thrive as leaders. In particular, they urge universities to develop programs for midcareer faculty that support timely promotion to full professor, the gateway to academic leadership. Institutions must critically examine structures and cultures that "exclude women or create unnecessary boundaries that they perceive as insurmountable or unattractive." This is difficult but essential work if universities expect to recruit the most talented students, faculty, and leaders.

Individual women can take direct action to interrupt the self-reinforcing negative cycle by developing and exercising personal agency; university leaders committed to individual women's advancement can facilitate this process. Role models, mentoring relationships, and effective networks accelerate professional advancement, but self-efficacy (agency) and support from university leaders are required for women to demonstrate leadership potential and intentionally plan for a leadership career. Ambitious women and their allies can be a force for change by demanding demographic diversity among leaders in the academy. That demand challenges the public-private divide inherent in hiring, tenure, and promotion processes and promotes equality of workplace tasks. Demographic diversity and institutional transformation thus go hand in hand. Together, women and their allies can undertake the essential work of re-examining long-standing practices that may appear gender neutral in their conception, but in reality serve to perpetuate the gendered university and the power of the gendered economy. Doing so can prepare today's institutions of higher learning for a more equitable future.

Note

1. Elsewhere in this symposium, Smooth (2016) discusses the heavy burden of service carried by women political scientists of colour.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

References

American Political Science Association. 2011. *Political Science in the 21st Century: Report of the Task Force on Political Science in the 21st Century*. https://www.apsanet.org/21stcentury/.

American Psychological Association. 2013. "Who Are Family Caregivers?" *Public Interest Directorate Reports*. http://www.apa.org/pi/about/publications/caregivers/.

Anyangwe, Eliza. 2011. "Q&A Best Bits: How Do You Promote Female Leadership in Higher Education?" *Guardian Professional*, May 24. http://www.guardian.co.uk/higher-education-network/blog/2011/may/24/women-leadership-higher-education-best.

Bailyn, Lotte. 2003. "Academic Careers and Gender Equity: Lessons Learned from MIT." *Gender, Work and Organization* 10 (2): 137–153.

Bandura, Albert. 1997. *Self-Efficacy*: *The Exercise of Control*. New York: Worth Publishing.

Battle, Conchita Y., and Chontrese M. Doswell. 2004. *Building Bridges for Women of Color in Higher Education: A Practical Guide for Success*. Dallas, TX: University Press of America.

Bilen-Green, Canan, Karen A. Froelich, and Sarah W. Jacobson. 2008. "The Prevalence of Women in Academic Leadership Positions, and Potential Impact on Prevalence of Women in the Professorial Ranks." 2008 WEPAN conference proceedings. http://www.ndsu.edu/fileadmin/forward/documents/WEPAN2.pdf.

Blau, Francine D., Janet M. Currie, Rachel T. A. Croson, and Donna K. Ginther. 2010. *Can Mentoring Help Female Assistant Professors? Interim Results from a Randomized Trial*. Working Paper 15707: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Bornstein, Rita. 2009. "Women and the Quest for Presidential Legitimacy." In *Women in Academic Leadership: Professional Strategies, Personal Choices*, edited by Diane R. Dean, Susan J. Bracken and Jeanie K. Allen, 208–237. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Chun, Edna, and Alvin Evans. 2012. *Diverse Administrators in Peril: The New Indentured Class in Higher Education*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Curtis, John W. 2013. "What Roles Are We Modeling? Gendered Academic Employment and Its Consequences." *Peer Review* 15(3). Association of American Colleges and Universities.

Damaske, Sarah, Elaine Howard Ecklund, Anne E. Lincoln, and Virginia J. White. 2014. "Male Scientists' Competing Devotions to Work and Family: Changing Norms in a Male-Dominated Profession." *Work and Occupations*. Published Online August 7. http://wox.sagepub.com/content/early/2014/08/07/0730888414539171.

Dean, Diane R. 2009. "Resources, Role Models, and Opportunity Makers: Mentoring Women in Academic Leadership." In *Women in Academic Leadership: Professional Strategies, Personal Choices*, edited by Diane R. Dean, Susan J. Bracken, and Jeanie K. Allen, 128–148. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Dean, Diane R., Susan J. Bracken, and Jeanie K. Allen, eds. 2009. *Women in Academic Leadership: Professional Strategies, Personal Choices*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Dominici, Francesca, Linda P. Fried, and Scott L. Zeger. 2009. "So Few Women Leaders." *Academe*. AAUP, July–August. http://www.aaup.org/article/so-few-women-leaders#.VAy-T1fQp8E.

Eckel, Peter D., and Adrianna Kezar. 2003. *Taking the Reins: Institutional Transformation in Higher Education*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Eddy, Pamela L. 2009. "Leading Gracefully." In *Women in Academic Leadership: Professional Strategies, Personal Choices*, edited by Diane R. Dean, Susan J. Bracken, and Jeanie K. Allen, 8–30. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Ely, Robin J., and Debra E. Meyerson. 2000. "Advancing Gender Equity in Organizations: The Challenge and Importance of Maintaining a Gender Narrative." *Organization* 7 (4): 589–608.

Garrett, Jinnie M. 2015. "Double Jeopardy: Examining the Low Representation of Women in Top Leadership Positions in Higher Education." The LEAP Challenge Blog, July 20. https://www.aacu.org/leap/liberal-education-nation-blog/double-jeopardy-examining-low-representation-women-top-leadership.

Grove, Jack. 2013. "Why Are There So Few Female Vice-Chancellors?" *Times Higher Education*, August 22. https://www.timeshighereducation.com/features/why-are-there-so-few-female-vice-chancellors/2006576.article.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1977. *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York: Basic Books.

Lederman, Doug. 2012. "The Aging College President." *Inside Higher Education*, March 12. http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/03/12/college-presidents-are-older-whiter-more-likely-come-outside-academe.

Manchester, Colleen Flaherty, Lisa M. Leslie, and Amit Kramer. 2013. "Is the Clock Still Ticking? An Evaluation of the Consequences of Stopping the Tenure Clock." *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 66 (1): 3–31. http://ssrn.com/abstract=2221557.

McClain, Paula, Gloria Y. A. Ayee, Taneisha N. Means, Alicia Reyes-Barriéntez, and Nura Sedique. 2016. "Race, Power, and Knowledge: Tracing the Roots of Exclusion in the Development of Political Science in the United States." *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 4 (3): 467–482. doi:10.1080/21565503.2016.1170704.

Mershon, Carol, and Denise Walsh. 2016. "Diversity in Political Science: Why It Matters and How to Get It." *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 4 (3): 462–466. doi:10.1080/21565503.2016.1170703.

Misra, Joya, Jennifer Hickes Lundquist, Elissa Holmes, and Stephanie Agiomavritis. 2011. "The Ivory Ceiling of Service Work." *Academe* 97 (1): 22–26.

Mo, Cecilia. 2012. "*What? Me Sexist*?" Stanford University, The Clayman Institute for Gender Research, November 5. http://gender.stanford.edu/news/2011/what-me-sexist.

New America Foundation. 2004. "The Way Women Work." Women & Family Program. http://www.newamerica.net.

Perna, Laura W. 2001. "Sex and Race Differences in Faculty Tenure and Promotion." *Research in Higher Education* 42 (5): 541–567.

Rowe, Mary P. 1989. "What Actually Works? The One-to-One Approach." In *Educating the Majority*, edited by Carol S. Pearson, Donna L. Shavlik, and Judith G. Touchton, 375–384. New York: ACE-Macmillan.

Sandberg, Sheryl. 2013. *Lean in: Women, Work, and the Will to Lead*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Santos, Gina Gaio, and Carlos Cabral-Cardoso. 2008. "Work-Family Culture in Academia: A Gendered View of Work-Family Conflict and Coping Strategies." *Gender in Management: An International Journal* 23 (6): 442–457.

Schilt, Kristen. 2011. *Just One of the Guys? Transgender Men and the Persistence of Gender Inequality*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Shepherd, Sue. 2015. "Four Myths About Why Women Aren't Getting the Top Jobs in Universities." *The Guardian*, June 22.

Singer, M. 1991. "The Relationship Between Employee Sex, Length of Service and Leadership Aspirations: A Study of Valence, Self-efficacy, and Attribution Perspectives." *Applied Psychology: An International Review* 40: 417–436.

Sloma-Williams, Lorraine, Sharon A. McDade, Rosalyn C. Richman, and Page S. Morahan. 2009. "The Role of Self-efficacy in Developing Women Leaders: A Case of Women in Academic Medicine and Dentistry." In *Women in Academic Leadership: Professional Strategies, Personal Choices*, edited by Diane R. Dean, Susan J. Bracken, and Jeanie K. Allen, 50–73. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Smith, Jessi L., and Meghan Huntoon. 2013. "Women's Bragging Rights: Overcoming Modesty Norms to Facilitate Women's Self-Promotion." *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 38: 447–459.

Smooth, Wendy G. 2016. "Intersectionality and Women's Advancement in the Discipline and Across the Academy." *Politics, Groups, and Identities* 4 (3): 513–528. doi:10.1080/21565503.2016.1170706.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2015. "Women in the Labor Force: A Databook." http://www.bls.gov/opub/reports/womens-databook/archive/women-in-the-labor-force-a-databook-2015.pdf.

Ward, Kelly, and Pamela L. Eddy. 2013. "Women and Academic Leadership: Leaning Out." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, December 13, A 27.

White, Judith. 2013. "HERS at Forty: Shaping a New Vision of Women's (and Men's) Liberation." *On Campus with Women* 41: 2–3.

Williams, Joan C. 2003. "The Subtle Side of Discrimination." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, April 14.

Williams, Joan C. 2005. "The Glass Ceiling and the Maternal Wall in Academia." In *The Challenge of Balancing Faculty Careers and Family Work*, edited by John W. Curtis, 91–105. New Directions for Higher Education, Number 130. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.