New Wine in Old Bottles: Cutting a New Path in the Academy

Mary H. Gresham, Dean, Graduate School of Education, State University of New York at Buffalo

Abstract

Despite the almost equal proportion of females to males who receive doctoral degrees in the U.S., women remain underrepresented in senior positions—faculty and administrative—in institutions of higher education. Unlike the more blatant discrimination extant before the era of civil rights legislation, barriers today are less obvious to the untutored observer. This paper will explore the gendered schemas that impede the equitable representation of women in senior administrative roles in higher education. Current formulations suggest a variety of rationales for this underrepresentation, including: traditional devaluation of women's abilities; beliefs about the appropriateness of roles and behaviors for women; unconscious biases which disadvantage women in multiple settings despite evidence of success; failure to appreciate the precedents provided by women administrators who created pathways for contemporary women in administration; as well as the reluctance to reconsider the requisite skill sets for a successful institutional leader in the 21st century. A consideration of leadership theory and research on the impact of stereotypes suggests ways in which women can develop the resilience necessary to challenge the traditions of the academy, traditions which remain heavily reliant on dated beliefs of male superiority and the rightness of the majority culture.

Introduction

It is said that putting new wine into old bottles will cause the bottle to explode. The new wine might still be fermenting and old, brittle wineskins are not supple enough to contain it. Considering women in positions of leadership as the "new wine," and "old bottles," the academy as we now know it, this is probably what many fear will happen if women assume a majority of leadership positions in higher education in the U.S. Old ways of doing business might change such that the current status quo could become a thing of the past. The time for clinging to traditions created by academic patriarchs is past, and yet the academy is notably resistant to change, despite the fact that globalization is prompting other sectors to rethink and reconsider what constitutes effective leadership in this era of increasing interdependence. Clearly, serious change is needed if higher education is to position itself for the challenges of the twenty-first century (Brint 2002). The issues are multifaceted—e.g., technology and the delivery of instruction; interdisciplinary perspectives and changes to curriculum and reward structures; demographic shifts and competition for talented faculty and students - and they are best approached with an appreciation for the contributions that can be offered by different viewpoints as opposed to the myopia typical of one dimensional thinking that emanates from a single frame of reference (cf. Bryson 2007).

Women have made great strides in educational attainment since the nineteenth century, but still remain underrepresented among both senior faculty and senior administrators in higher education. Women comprise just over half of the population in the U.S. and are projected to receive 57% of bachelor's degrees and 51% of doctoral degrees awarded in 2008-09 (Digest of Education Statistics 2007); yet as of 2006, women represented only about 23% of all college presidents and only 14% of presidents at research institutions. It would be wise to capitalize on -

not marginalize - this amazing intellectual diversity in the hopes of finding new methods for addressing the challenges facing the academy. There also remains a concomitant need to develop and implement policies to address the structural impediments which suppress parity for women. Although social, cultural, and structural barriers account for much of the inertia, women themselves can do more to facilitate the change that must come by understanding the realities of leadership, as well as the rules of the game. Maya Angelou offered the story of Mrs. Johnson, a woman who found herself alone with two children and very few resources after her husband had left her; Mrs. Johnson said, "I looked up the road I was going and back the way I come, and since I wasn't satisfied, I decided to cut me a new path" (Angelou 1993, 22).

Lessons from Precedents

When women were first admitted to institutions of higher learning, there was little attempt to hide the prevailing belief that they should be treated as inferior to their male counterparts. Women students were harassed, segregated in their classes, and often denied access to facilities and activities that were made available to men. As administrators, women held token positions as heads of home science departments where they learned domestic "arts" in preparation for their presumed roles as wives and mothers; as chairs of these departments, they were also charged with caring for the needs of women students (Fitzgerald 2007). But rather than accept the belief that women were inferior to men, early female educators 'cut a path' around the barriers they were confronted with by celebrating their strengths through the establishment of professional networks that were "broader and deeper" than might have been expected (Nidiffer and Bashaw 2001, 3). These networks, such as the National Association of Deans of Women (1917), and the Ladies Christian Association (1858, precursor to the YWCA), were formed in response to the inequitable treatment of women in the academy and in society, and provided venues for women's intellectual and professional development.

Out of these organizations came research on student development, journals, advocacy for research-based models for student guidance, professional organizations, and the development of professional standards that would ultimately cause profound changes in the way campuses managed student concerns. Women in administration also won the opportunity for female students to attend co-ed classes, have team sports and, as greater numbers of women enrolled in universities, these early administrators turned the token role of Dean of Women into a respected profession. As the position Dean of Women became more highly valued by the campus administration, it was replicated in Dean of Men positions, but not until almost two decades after the deans of women were established. Asked what it took to prepare to become Dean of Men, one man's response was "to marry a good woman" since the belief was that men are born leaders not developed through study and the acquisition of relevant skills (Schwartz 1997, 514). Paradoxically, most women eventually lost their Dean of Women positions in the name of fiscal economy and a single Dean of Students position, responsible for all student concerns, was created and typically given to men. Nonetheless, the contributions of these female pioneers in higher education served as the foundation for two disciplines—College Student Personnel and Educational Administration. Early Dean's of Women set the standard for the treatment of the whole student in institutions of higher education; they saw the value of a holistic approach to caring for students that treated the physical and social health of the individual as being important to their intellectual and academic success. The critical analysis and professionalism that women

brought to what was considered a tangential role in the academy provided the foundation for the evolution of the administrative role of dean of women into what is now a Vice President for Student Affairs position in the senior ranks of higher education administration (Fitzgerald 2007; Jones and Komives 2001; Nidiffer and Bashaw 2001; Schwartz 1997; Chamberlain 1991).

The lessons that can be learned from these early pioneers are still valuable today. Although positions given to women in higher education were narrowly defined at the turn of the century, these administrators remained confident in themselves and in their ability to change the situations they and their female students found themselves in. Women in higher education, during the early 20th century, cut a path through their environment that demonstrates the importance of not allowing others to define our identity, our roles, or our worth. Moreover, one can also see the value of developing and maintaining supportive relationships; of taking one's intelligence seriously; of a highly focused commitment to action, and of maintaining the moral high ground in the face of extreme provocation. Out of the "academic kitchens" (Nerad 1999; Fitzgerald 2007) to which women were relegated, came an innovative menu of policies, programs, and standards that changed for the better the academic climate and culture of higher education. Taking responsibility for developing competence and grooming others was the hallmark of these early leaders; we would do well to learn from their successes.

Social Constructs of Women in Society and the Workplace

The responsibilities that early administrators were given rested on the social constructions of the day, and were clearly aligned with dominant views about the roles and attributes associated with different sexes. Without the legal remedies available today, there was less opportunity for them to confront the prevailing restrictions. Discourse on gender roles and stereotypes in the current context suggests that for women today there is less agreement and seemingly less confidence about who they are and what their "place" is than was the case for early feminist educators. It has been suggested that the feminist movement in the U.S. today has lost much of the influence it once had because it has excluded working class women, those outside of western countries, and those outside of the academy. In the U.S., this may be because laws have articulated protections against obvious forms of discrimination—for example, educational access, violence against women, voting, employment - and the energy that remains primarily in the academy has become more focused on the ontology rather than the remedies for the manifestations of gender inequity (see also Tokarczyk 1993; Browne 2007; Reed 2002; Bryson 2007).

There is an implacable tone to the bifurcated considerations of gender which on the one hand argues for affirmation and acceptance of essential differences between the sexes (Gilligan 1993; Hakim 2007; Baron-Cohen 2007). On the other hand, there is the position that difference should not define women in any substantive way since to do so supports the dominant authority that is responsible for the current cultural and political arrangements extant in society (Bryson 2007; Crompton 2007; Clegg 2008). Since there is neither clarity nor apparent agreement among women about their "place" and what their role is in the world of work, it appears that women are not in agreement about wanting equal treatment or equal consideration for various positions in the social hierarchy. This fundamental disagreement about the way that women fit into society allows those who would protect the status quo to do so, and this carries over into the world of academia and women's positions in it.

Gendered Schemas

In discussing evolutionary psychology, Baron-Cohen (2007) proposes the empathizing/systematizing (E-S) continuum of behavior that distinguishes the interactions of men and women. On the empathizing end, one has a tendency to respond with a notable degree of acuity to the emotions and non-verbal cues of others. A systematizing individual concentrates on identifying the mechanisms and rules which underlie certain activities or behaviors. According to Baron-Cohen, on the "average," more men than women have a biological predisposition for systematizing, and women, more than men, are biologically predisposed to empathize, although one cannot predict aptitudes for empathizing or systematizing based on sex. E-S theory allows for the influence of both nature and the environment in shaping these tendencies, but because these approaches to understanding are intimately connected to one's sex, certain occupations will always have dominant genders related to them (e.g., more men in math related areas).

Hakim (2007) posits a "preference theory" to explain the different choices that women and men make pertaining to the jobs they hold. Women are able to choose different lifestyles because they have benefitted from equal opportunity legislation, contraception, the shift to skilled labor, jobs for secondary earners, and the relative weight of attitudes and values in making choices in affluent societies. Hakim says that personal choices account for the workforce divisions in society more than sex role ideologies or patriarchal values (194). "Victim feminism" blames men and social norms for the positions that women occupy in the workforce and in society (Hakim 2007, 211); preference theory, on the other hand, asserts that few women prioritize careers. There are three lifestyle groups that account for the variation in women's preferences for how to live their lives: "adaptives" prefer to balance both work and family life; "home centered" profess family values like caring and sharing, and "work centered" maintain "marketplace" values such as competition and individualism (Hakim 2007, 199). According to Hakim, this variability is a problem for feminists who assume not only that women are more homogenous in their desire to work, but also because a central tenet of feminist arguments is that men and women have similar interests and that they are often incompatible (209).

Author/feminist Mary Wollstonecraft (1759-1797) was passionate about the rights and equality of women, yet there is reference to the "Wollstonecraft dilemma" which suggests that to assert difference is to jeopardize any claim to demand equal treatment, the logic being that if special accommodation due to reproductive functioning is required there is no equality since this does not pertain to men (Crompton 2007). Crompton (2007) does note, however, that to be equal does not rule out being different, "The opposite of equality is not difference, but inequality" (232). For some, gender essentialism is perceived as providing support for the status quo: it may be said that the claim of natural differences legitimizes different choices, which in turn justifies inequities in opportunities and salary, which negates any recognition of the dominant-*cum*-masculine context in which all of this takes place.

Crompton (2007) offers a critique of preference theory, asserting that gender essential theorists emphasize choice over context and ignore the possibility that preferences may in fact be based on "habit, low expectations and unjust conditions" (238). Women are still concentrated in work that is devalued and underpaid, which supports the belief that natural differences are associated with inferiority. The human capital explanation for salary inequities is that women are either less productive than men, or that they leave more often to attend to family responsibilities and because of this inconsistency are less valuable (Browne 2007; see also Marschke et al. 2007). It may be the case that gendered behavior is merely attributed to

conformity to gendered social norms because there are often negative consequences for nonconformity for both men and women. These norms "affect the distribution of wealth and power, because the norms for successful behavior for positions of authority collide with norms of femininity" (Robeyns 2007, 57; see also Yoder 2001; Martell and DeSmet 2001; Chliwniak 1997; Oakley 2000). That is, social norms for women and for men represent women as being collaborative, communal, and process oriented, while men are seen as being more decisive, authoritative, and task oriented.

It bears repeating that western formulations regarding norms for women do not account for the realities of most of the female population globally; or even among working women and some ethnic women in America. It is the case that culture, language, and sociopolitical hierarchies cause significant variation in both the roles and the identities that define women; this also calls into question the assumptions which underlie some essentialist theories (see Hakim 2007).

What is more broadly applicable, however, is the cumulative advantage men enjoy based on their traditional hegemony as leaders in society, such that their constructions of what is and is not important, and what should or should not be known constitute the standard against which all else is measured. The famous anthropologist, Bronislaw Malinowski gained prominence in his field because of his research on the Trobriand Islanders which described a male dominated society in great detail. Years later, Annette Weiner revisited the island and found the opposite to be true, that in fact, wealth and power were concentrated in the hands of Trobriand women (Schwartz 1997). This is but one example of how observations and descriptions of 'reality' are often filtered by the lens through which one is looking.

In Gilligan's (1993) classic *in a different voice*, women were given a platform that touted the legitimacy of their lenses. Not only did this book assert the importance of acknowledging the contributions of a feminine viewpoint, it also highlighted the fact that so-called scientifically 'objective' theories pertaining to moral development were based on masculine norms. She highlighted the different ways that women relate to their environment, their underlying concern with relationships, and gave legitimacy to a woman's right to see things from an alternative perspective. Gilligan's work reinforced the fact that "categories of knowledge are human constructions" (6), and emphasized the importance of the feminine voice in either transforming or enabling patriarchal dominance.

Grumet (1988) also invokes the idea that we enable the context in which we live; it is not forced upon us. She notes "…what is most fundamental to our lives as men and women sharing a moment on this planet is the process and experience of reproducing ourselves" (Grumet 1988, 8). The process of 'reproducing ourselves' further suggests the biases that each of us has that limit our perceptions and helps to explain how gendered views in our society come to exist and are supported.

Perceptions are constructed while processing incoming data through a schematic lens (Bem 1981). Schema can be described as the expected framework through which one sees the world. Society would be elevated by relinquishing its insistence on the importance of gender distinctions.

> The gender distinctions that remained would still be perceived—perhaps even cherished—but they would not function as imperialistic schemata for organizing everything else, and the artificial constraints of gender on the individual's unique blend of temperament and behavior would be eliminated… (Bem 1981, 363).

Bem goes on to suggest that feminists should seek an aschematic world, not an androgynous one. Abandoning gendered schemas does not mean abandoning the special uniqueness that distinguishes men and women; rather it is giving up the expectations about what is real, what is convention, what is 'normal,' and what is presumption, most of which pay homage to paradigms that are largely unrelated to the dynamic, diverse world that we live in.

Stereotypes, Unconscious Bias and Devaluation of Women's Work

Stereotypes serve as convenient fictions that oversimplify information about things and individuals. They are convenient because they codify underlying assumptions that, in most cases represent some implicit bias or prejudice that is subjective and unfounded. For women in higher education, the academy is a bureaucratic system that was founded on traditional of beliefs about male superiority; it is still a place where the biases about women and their place in the academy remain subtle but nonetheless evident (Wylie, Jacobsen and Fosado 2007; Bailyn 1999). In the academy, women remain clustered at levels of middle managers with few progressing to the senior ranks of the administration. The 2007 publication on American College Presidents reported that 23% of American college presidents were women, most of whom were at community colleges and only a few at research universities (American Council on Education). That is, fewer women are found in leadership positions at more prestigious universities.

Both men and women perceive and prefer leaders to be men and both evaluate men more positively than women on the performance of the same tasks (Martell and DeSmet 2001; Oakley 2000; Chliwniak 1997). The glass ceiling may actually be attributed to a desire to hire someone who is like the predecessor, usually a white male in both higher education and in industry (Chliwniak 1997). Most stereotypes about men refer to them as having agentic characteristics - assertive, dominant, and controlling; while women are stereotypically described as communal - caring, nurturing, and sensitive (Eagly and Karau 2002). The orientation of western society is toward individualism, mastery over the environment, and win-lose competitions. Non-western cultures are more accepting of the view that dependence is not necessarily pathological; that one can and should live in harmony with nature, and that the collective group is more important than the individual. The problem is that culturally, most individuals in the U.S. have been conditioned to see a concern for relationships and a less aggressive style as equivalent to vapidness or a lack of intelligence. The emphasis on gendered norms feeds stereotypic assumptions that need to be decoupled from the actual effectiveness of such behaviors. Ironically, women are penalized for not conforming to gendered norms or stereotypes; if they are seen as behaving like men, they are castigated with offensive names, but if they exhibit stereotypic feminine behavior, they are often seen as not being adequate. It is too often assumed that the stereotypic gender role of an individual also determines the standard against which competence should be evaluated.

"The heart of the problem is that equal talent and accomplishment are viewed as unequal when seen through the eyes of prejudice...." Prejudice is not solely the purview of men; on search committees, women have been known to judge other women harshly based on a belief that hiring someone less able might make other women look bad (Bailyn 1999, 6). Women or men who do not conform to stereotypical norms are seen as unnatural, behaving in ways that are unacceptable. (e.g., Margaret Thatcher was called "Attila the Hen" and "Iron Lady" because she rose to the highest leadership position in politics (Eagly and Karau 2002). In the 1980's there was a 'dress for success' movement when women were encouraged to wear more dark suits with only a slight nod to being feminine, e.g., wearing a small necklace with a suit. The message was,

of course, that women would be tolerated and perhaps more likely hired if they looked more like a man; just as women in higher education were segregated for the comfort of the men in the academy, this movement served to make men more comfortable around women.

It is suggested that gendered norms provide the means for men to preserve their privileged position in society; if women are not typecast, they might need to be evaluated fairly and they may excel over their male counterparts. One explanation asserts that men's active suppression of women—whether conscious or unconscious - stems from childhood when the process of individuation required male children to separate from their mothers. This process highlights the relative powerlessness of the child (male) in relation to the mother (woman); this relationship struggle may be the implicit motivation for the devaluation of women in adult life (Oakley 2000). Salary disparities are clearly evident when jobs that have been traditional for women (e.g., teaching, librarian) are compared with those traditional for men (scientist, corporate CEO); women are paid less and the work is valued less. The gender composition of various occupations "accounts for over 90% of the gender wage gap" (Cohen and Huffman 2003; see also Goldin 2002; Bailyn 1999; Bellas 1997). Even in hiring patterns, it is noticeable that the more prestigious universities have fewer women among the faculty. In 2001, female faculty were 48% of two-year college faculty, 38% of four-year college faculty, and 28% of research universities (Wilson 2004; see also Zemsky 2001; Martell and DeSmet 2001; Tokarczyk 1993). When women are associated with a discipline, it is also deemed less prestigious and is less valued by both women and men (England et al. 2007; Cohen and Huffman 2003; Goldin 2002; Nidiffer 2001; Chliwniak 1997).

Whether or not bias is always operating at a conscious level has been tested in an experiment involving auditions for an orchestra. When the identity of the applicants at an audition was concealed, it resulted in increased selections of female musicians; the researchers believe that blind auditions could account for as much as one-third of the additional women hired in American orchestras (Goldin and Rouse 2000). Implicit Association Tests (IAT) measure automatic positive or negative responses to prompts related to responses to gender and race, as well as other phenomenon. Using this method, women, when compared to men, have been found to be judged as less competent and, have more attributions of luck or external help as reasons for their successes; moreover, women are judged negatively when they are perceived to exhibit behavior that goes against gendered norms (see also Lee 2005; Eagly and Karau 2002; Deaux and Emswiller 1974).

Taken together, gendered schemas and norms which serve to establish the boundaries of acceptable behavior, stereotypes, and unconscious bias each contribute to delegitimizing the way one chooses to define oneself. Because there is such debate among women, however, over which 'norm' is acceptable, it is easy for anyone who wants to be dismissive about parity to rationalize doing so. It is particularly unfortunate when women fail to appreciate the complexity of their diverse personas, opting instead to set boundaries which have limited relevance for the majority of women whose support must be cultivated if change is to occur. This time we have identified the 'Others,' but they are also us.

Leadership without an asterisk

In an interview shortly after taking office, Harvard President Drew Faust was asked how it felt to be Harvard's first woman president. President Faust's response was:

> I'm the president of Harvard. I'm not the woman president of Harvard. And by that I meant I wasn't a president with an asterisk who was to be defined by her gender before she was defined by her policies, her effectiveness and all the other things that make up a president. (Faust, D.G. 2009)

Dr. Mildred Garcia, President of California State University Dominguez Hills was asked what advice she would give to others who aspired to her position; her response was "Acquire all the education you can, get as much experience as you can but never lose your soul" (Mendoza 2008, 17). President Garcia admitted that she was told to change her clothes, her hair and her jewelry, to not use so much color and to stop talking about diversity so much; she rejected that advice, opting to remain who she was and had always been.

Leadership styles (Lewin et al. 1939) range along a continuum from authoritarian (or autocratic); to participative (or democratic); to delegative or laissez-faire. Leadership theories probably began with the "great man" idea, which presumed that leadership ability is inherent in men. Further analyses of leadership styles highlight the contrast between transactional styles (which is based on a *quid pro quo* system of reward and punishment related to outcomes) and transformational styles (which is based on relationships, intrinsic motivation, and an emphasis on process). It is probably no surprise, given the gendered norms discussed, that women are said to be 'stereotypically' more transformational and men more 'stereotypically' transactional; 'stereotypic' because one would be hard pressed to identify clearly delineated boundaries in current considerations of leadership based on gender (see VanEngen and Willemson 2000; Yoder 2001). We know, too, that context is critical since leadership strategies have to be adjusted depending on who is being led (VanVugt et al. 2008; Avolio 2007), and we know that both intellectual flexibility and interpersonal agility are key for any successful leader (VanVugt 2008; Petrick et al. 1999). Despite this knowledge, social role expectations persist (Eagly and Karau 2002; Chliwniak 1997) because they are endorsed and perpetuated through both culture and the language. For example, consider the following statement in praise of a woman who was a physics professor: "In many ways Ms.Athey was not typical. From the beginning of her career she was an exceptionally promising scholar" (Fogg 2004). Is this really meant to say that most women could not be exceptionally promising scholars?

Leadership theories that attempt to take gender into account make far too many disclaimers in order to explain the fine points of masculine vs. feminine leadership styles (e.g., Yoder 2001; Eagly and Johnson 1990). In their comments, both President Faust and President Garcia rejected the gendered pigeonholes that were being implied and their answers tell why they are in the positions they are in: women who lose their own identity in the face of normative pressures will not be leaders long. As Shakespeare wrote, "This above all to thine own self be true…" (Hamlet, Act I, scene iii); it was good advice for Polonius' son as he set out on his travels and it is excellent advice for women in higher education administration. That women may focus on the relationship as much as the outcome may in fact be an effective profile for leaders in the global world.

Leadership for the 21st century

It is still true that in the U.S. women are socialized in ways different from men (Nidiffer 2001; Tannen 1990; Lipman-Blumen 1992). Women are more interested in making connections and forging relationships; by virtue of our physicality we have an intimate relationship with change because it is thrust upon us at a relatively early age, and we have no choice but to negotiate these various disruptions without taking a hiatus from life; and process is important to us, but so, too, are outcomes. The twenty-first century requires leadership that will demand a greater appreciation of our global interdependence along with a set of competencies to aid in the management of organizations that are diverse in terms of needs, individuals, and connections to the myriad communities to which we will belong. The concepts of rugged individualism, rigid boundaries, and presumptions about dominance have little place among the universities of the future. "Excellent global leaders, therefore, are able to understand complex issues from different strategic perspectives and act out a cognitively complex strategy by playing multiple roles in a highly integrated and complementary way" (Petrick et al. 1999, 60). For the university in a global world, successful leaders will echo these attributes as the bases for developing knowledge and the means for developing successful interventions have become increasingly dependent on multidisciplinary collaborations.

Emergent literature examines the multiple competencies that women develop by virtue of their sex role socialization in a dominant culture as compared with traditional or male leadership attributes. For example, emergent leadership involves a collectivistic approach, relationships that are important, flexibility, communications skills, the sharing of power, and decision making (Nidiffer 2001, 108). Nidiffer (2001) makes an excellent observation by suggesting then, that these complex sets of competencies should give women a "competitive advantage" for the new requisites for leadership.

One problem, however, with much of the literature about leadership is the distance between the theory and the reality of actually being a leader. Personally, when faced with a staff member who took out his frustrations physically on a female student, the last thing that concerned me was sharing either power or decision making. One thing that women must do in order to help groom other women is to be honest about what is actually required to be an effective leader in the academy. Women may possess the ability to function as emergent leaders, but so too do women focus on individuals, outcomes and power when needed. Another president offered the following: "…the healthy, competent adult in contemporary society—regardless of sex—is that individual capable of expressing a broad range of traits and characteristics in situationally appropriate circumstances"(Nidiffer 2001, 112-113). While we do know that there is no one ideal type of leader, I disagree with the idea that one should act like a man or that one needs to modify their "sex-typical" behavior; this is no more true for women than it is for men. What is sex-'typical' anyway, in what situation, with whom and for what purpose? [Then again, there was the time I got out of a speeding ticket by living up to the stereotype the officer had about women …]

Resilience

Christman and McClellan (2008) describe a study of female administrators who held various positions of leadership in an Educational Leadership program. Christman and McClellan, admitted to expecting, based on the literature, to find women who acted in ways that demonstrated being collaborative, nurturing, and caring, and they expected to hear feminist

discourse in their interactions with these administrators. They found instead that these "…resilient women administrators were playing a different game altogether" (2008, 4). In theory, the binary options for gendered norms create dominant and subordinate positions; these social constructions put women at odds with both male and female expectations for leaders. Women struggle against these social roles in order to obtain positions, and in order to receive any recognition for competence once they have the position. Christman and McClellan arrive at the conclusion that there was actually a considerable blurring of the gendered boundaries among this group. Concluding that "gender identity and leadership are more complex than what could fit into one gender model or another," (21) they suggest that a "multidimensional gender is required by today's leadership" (23).

The process/outcome distinctions notwithstanding, most research considers resilience to be the ability to prevail in difficult situations; the idea of overcoming adversity is a theme throughout various considerations (Christman and McClellan 2008; McCubbin 2001; Grotberg 2003; Luthar, Cicchetti and Becker 2000; Richardson 2002). As a process it is the ability to successfully negotiate complex environments, and as an outcome it refers to a skill set that enables successful performance regardless of challenges. There is also consensus that building resilience involves having supportive relationships, being intrinsically motivated to succeed and cultivating humor, optimism, and persistence (op. cit.). Richardson (2002) offers the concept of "biopsychospiritual homeostasis" as the "comfort zone" or point at which "…one has adapted physically, mentally and spiritually to a set of circumstances whether good or bad" (311). According to Richardson's metatheory, resilience or protective factors are developed through a "law of disruption and reintegration:" one learns to cope because of continual disruptions to this homeostatic state which one seeks to maintain.

As we go further into this century, it becomes more and more apparent that new solutions are needed for problems that are increasingly complex. Women are in a position to make major contributions to leadership in the academy, but it is important that we become more comfortable in our own skin, whatever that may be, without apology.

Conclusion

The feminist movement in the U.S., up until the 1970's, instigated change in tangible ways because the goals were well articulated regarding ending the forms of discrimination that barred access to myriad settings, mirroring the call for civil rights and equality for all. The real question now is what change do we seek: gender equality or equal treatment (see also Browne 2007) and the concomitant ability to chart a course broad enough to change the rules of engagement?

It would seem that the focus of any action toward woman's greater participation in society's reward structure should be directed at influencing the context itself. As it stands, it seems that women are demanding the right to fuller participation in a system not designed with women in mind. Kelly (1991) noted that there are many reasons to account for female segregation in the academy, but they all "turn on an understanding of higher education as an institution geared toward meeting men's needs." As former Harvard President Lawrence Summers said, the ideal faculty member demonstrates extreme commitment to their career, making the career the primary focus and priority in one's life. Is this the arrangement that women want?

The established route to administration in higher education involves first becoming a faculty member and obtaining tenure, then progressing through the department and decanal leadership hierarchy, at which point one might become eligible for openings in the senior ranks

of the administration in the academy. Unfortunately that path is fraught with land mines for women who chose to pursue a balance between academia and family. It would seem that the intellectual and experiential breadth gained from the pursuit of diverse experiences should be of some value in the academy.

Policy changes at every governance level (federal, state or institutional) that could change the institutional landscape for the politics of promotion are needed to provide a more level field for enabling the full integration of women into the power structure in the academy: Is the time to tenure adequate for individuals who want to experience the multiple roles they have access to? Can tenure clocks be more flexible? Might quality be factored into considerations for promotion, not just quantity? Why not create mentoring programs that are important not only as support systems for helping to build resilience and self esteem, but also for helping newer members of the academy understand the informal networks and understandings that might empower them sooner.   Can we eliminate the stigma on caregiver responsibilities and provide this benefit as an automatic matter of course rather than making either women, or men, ask for it? And then there are those token offices on campus that are called Equal Opportunity Offices: could we make them whole in terms of the sanctions they could impose for searches not conducted properly, or for committees without diverse representation, or for blatant discrimination in hiring practices? Might we also make the administration responsible for, and actually hold campuses accountable for, ensuring that resources are evenly distributed—and require monitoring and redress more than once every 5 or 10 years? And outside of the academy, could we not create mandates for education about the social constructions of gender to begin early and continue throughout the PreK-12 years of schooling so that the next generation might not need to have this on their plates? Could we not develop policies that would support a different world view, such that there would be no question of whether or not those who do the same jobs and have the same credentials should receive the same salary? The route to parity for women in higher education administration is complex because the roots of exclusion are deeply embedded in our culture. Policy changes and legal remedies are required, without question, in order to resolve current practices that still discriminate against the personal flexibility that many women seek in the academy, but this alone will not result in the type of paradigmatic shift pertaining to constructions of gender that is needed to make room for the potential that half of the world's population represent.

Women bring a different voice and add balance to considerations about creating an environment that supports academic excellence. Recognizing that one's career occupies only one facet of an individual's life, be they female or male, informs faculty and staff that they are important not only because of their contributions, but because of who they are as individuals. It is surprising how much more productive people are when they feel valued. In my experience in the academy, people will go far beyond what is actually required of them in their contracts when their effort is acknowledged and rewarded.

Universities are supposed to be places where knowledge is created; there should not be a culture of competition in order to obtain either rewards or recognition. Just because there is no NIH or NSF money to support a line of inquiry does not mean that it is not an important area of study.   The academy should be the arbiter of what questions should be explored, not the corporate state. Arts and cultural areas of study in the U.S. are not given the weight of science and technology for example in neither institutional nor funding priorities. As we establish deeper global connections, however, these areas might help to find the common ground needed to facilitate discussion and innovation, especially in the area of American elementary and

secondary education. Multiple perspectives directed at the same problem will yield more relevant answers since environments and institutions, as well as personal and interpersonal problems, are more and more interdependent in today's world. There are myriad factors that contribute to the problems of obesity in children, or student achievement, or eating disorders for example. The world's complexity requires a postmodern approach for generating answers to the challenges we face. Eliminating terms like 'hard' and 'soft' disciplines, which suggest superior and inferior positions in some hierarchy of knowledge is a good place to start. Institutions need to be arranged so that collaborations are feasible and so that quality and depth are valued over mass production.

Women often approach problems differently because the range of our experiences has given us a different lens; we need to be comfortable with that and so do others. This is not to say that all women are wonderful administrators, or scholars, but given the opportunity to experience our own power, we have the potential to hone the skills needed to make major contributions to the academy on a variety of levels. The old bottles that hold the academy need the effervescence of new wine because the old bottles need to be broken to make way for the twenty-first century.

References

American Council on Education. 2002. Number of presidents from outside of higher education nearly doubles. *American Council on Education*. http://www.acenet.edu/AM/PrinterTemplate.cfm?Section=Search&template=/CM/HTMLDisplay.cfm&ContentID=17678 (accessed June 29, 2009).

Angelou, M. 1993. *Wouldn't Take Nothing for My Journey Now*. New York: Bantam Books.

Avolio, B. J. 2007. Promoting more integrative strategies for leadership theory-building. *American Psychologist* 62 (1): 25-33.

Bailyn, L. March 1999. A study on the status of women faculty in science at MIT: Massachusetts Institute of Technology. *The MIT Faculty Newsletter*, 1-15.

Baron-Cohen, S. 2007. Does biology play any role in sex differences in the mind? In *The Future of Gender*, ed. J. Brown, 77-97. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bashaw, C. T. 2001. "Reassessment and redefinition": The NAWDC and higher education for women. In *Women Administrators in Higher Education: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. J. Nidiffer and C. T. Bashaw, 157-182. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Bashaw, C. T. "To serve the needs of women": The AAUW, NAWDC, and persistence of academic women's support networks. In *Women Administrators in Higher Education: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. J. Nidiffer and C. T. Bashaw, 249-270. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Bashaw, C. T. and J. Nidiffer. 2001. Women administrators in higher education today and in the future. In *Women Administrators in Higher Education: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. J. Nidiffer and C. T. Bashaw, 271-278. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Bellas, M. L. 1997. Disciplinary differences in faculty salaries: Does gender bias play a role? *Journal of Higher Education* 68: 299-321.

Bem, S. L. 1981. Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. *Psychological Review* 88: 354-364.

Brint, S. 2002. *The Future of the City of Intellect*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Browne, J. 2007. *The Future of Gender.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bryson, V. 2007. Perspectives on gender equality: challenging the terms of debate. In *The Future of Gender*, ed. J. Brown, 35-53. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Chamberlain, M. K. 1991. *Women in Academe: Progress and Prospects*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Chliwniak, L. 1997. *Higher Educational Leadership: Analyzing the Gender Gap*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Christman, D. and R. McClellan. 2008. Living on barbed wire: Resilient women administrators in educational leadership programs. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 44 (1): 3-29.

Clegg, S. 2008. Femininities/Masculinities and a sense of self: Thinking gendered academic identities and the intellectual self. *Gender and Education* 20 (3): 209-221.

Cohen, P. N. and M. L. Huffman. 2003. Individuals, jobs, and labor markets: The devaluation of women's work. *American Sociological Review* 68 (3): 443-463.

Crompton, R. 2007. Gender inequality and the gendered division of labour. In *The Future of Gender, in ed.* J. Brown. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Deaux and Emswiller. 1974. Explanations of successful performance on sex-linked tasks: What is skill for the male is luck for the female. *Journal of Personal Social Psychology* 29: 80-85.

Eagly, A. H. and B. Johnson. 1990. Gender and leadership style: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin* 108 (2): 233-256.

Eagly, A. H. and S. J. Karau. 2002. Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review* 109 (3): 573-598.

England, P., P. Allison, and S. Li. 2007. Why are some academic fields tipping toward female? The sex composition of U.S. fields of doctoral degree receipt, 1971-2002. *Sociology of Education* 80 (1): 23.

Farr-Brown, C. 2001. Patterns of leadership: The impact of female authority in four women's colleges. In *Women Administrators in Higher Education: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. J. Nidiffer and C.T. Bashaw, 37-66. Albany: State University of New York Press

Faust, D. G. 11 June 2009. Interview by Chrystina Freeland, A View From the Top. From the *Financial Times* website: http://www.ft.com/cms/8a38c684-2a26-11dc-9208-000b5df10621.html?_i_referralObject=5907119&fromSearch=n (access on July 2, 2009).

Fitzgerald, T. 2007. An absent presence: Women professors at the University of New Zealand 1911-1961. *Journal of Educational Administration and History* 39 (3): 239-253.

Fogg, P. 2004. How one woman defined the odds in a male-dominated discipline. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 51: 1.

Fogg, P. and R. Williams. 2004. Where are they now? *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 51 (15): A10.

Gilligan, C. 1993. *in a different voice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Goldin, C. 2002. A pollution theory of discrimination: Male and female differences in occupations and earnings. NBER Working Paper, NO.W8985, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=315335.

Goldin, C. and Rouse, C. 2000. Orchestrating impartiality: The impact of "blind" auditions on female musicians. *The American Economic Review* 90 (4): 715-741.

Grotberg, E.H. 2003. *Resilience For Today: Gaining Strength from Adversity*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Grumet, M. R. 1988. *Bitter Milk*. Massachusetts: The University of Massachusetts Press.

Hakim, C. 2007. The politics of female diversity in the twenty-first century. In *The Future of Gender*, ed. J. Brown, 191-227. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Jones, S. R. and S. R. Komives. 2001. Contemporary issues of women as senior student affairs officers. In *Women Administrators in Higher Education: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives,* ed. J. Nidiffer and C. T. Bashaw, 231-248. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Kelly, G. P. and S. Slaughter. 1991. *Women's Higher Education In Comparative Perspective*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Lee, A. J. 2005. Unconscious bias theory in employment discrimination litigation. *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review* 40: 481-503.

Lewin, K., R. Lippirt, and R. White. 1939. Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. *Journal of Social Psychology* 10: 271-301.

Lipman-Blumen, J. 1992. Connective leadership: Female leadership styles in the 21st century workplace. *Sociological Perspectives* 35: 183-203.

Luthar, S. S., D. Cicchetti, and Bronwyn Becker. 2000. The construct of resilience: A critical evaluation and guidelines for future work. *Child Development* 71: 543-562.

Marschke, R., S. Laursen, J. M. Nielsen, and P. Rankin. 2007. Demographic inertia revisited: An immodest proposal to achieve equitable gender representation among faculty in higher education. *Journal of Higher Education* 78 (1): 1-26.

Martell R. F. and A. L. DeSmet. 2001. A diagnostic ratio approach to measuring beliefs about the leadership abilities of male and female managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 86 (6): 1223-1231.

Mendoza, V. 2008. Women redefining leadership. *Diverse*, March.

Nerad, M. 1999. *The Academic Kitchen: A Social History of Gender Stratification at University of California, Berkeley.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Nidiffer, J. 2001. Crumbs from the boy's table: the first century of coeducation. In *Women Administrators in Higher Education: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. by J. Nidiffer and C. T. Bashaw, 13-36. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Nidiffer, J. 2001. New leadership for a new century: Women's contribution to leadership in higher education. In *Women Administrators in Higher Education: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. J. Nidiffer and C. T. Bashaw, 101-134. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Nidiffer, J. and C. T. Bashaw. 2001. *Women Administrators in Higher Education: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Novick, R. 1998. The comfort corner: Fostering resiliency and emotional intelligence. *Childhood Education* 74: 200-204.

Oakley, J. G. 2000. Gender-based barriers to senior management positions: Understanding the scarcity of female CEO's. *Journal of Business Ethics* 27: 321-334.

Reed, S. E. 2002. Sisterhood was powerful. *The American Prospect*. http://www.prospect.org/cs/current_issue. (accessed June 9, 2009).

Richardson, G. E. 2002. The metatheory of resilience and resiliency. *Journal of Clinical Psychology* 58 (3): 307-321.

Robeyns, I. 2007. When will society be gender just? In *The Future of Gender,* ed. by J. Brown, 54-74. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schwartz, R. A. 1997. Reconceptualizing the leadership roles of women in higher education: A brief history on the importance of deans of women. *Journal of Higher Education* 68 (5): 502-522.

Tannen, D. 1990. Sex, lies, and conversations; Why is it so hard for men and women to talk to each other? The Washington Post, June 24, 1990.

Tokarczyk, M. M. and E. A. Fay. 1993. *Working class women in the Academy: laborers in the knowledge factory.* Amherst, Mass.: University of Massachusetts Press.

U.S. National Center for Education Statistics. 2007. First professional degrees earned in selected professions: 1970 to 2006. *Digest of Education Statistics* (2007). http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/tables/09s0293.pdf (accessed June 29, 2009).

Van Engen, M.L. and T.M. Willemsen. 2000. Gender and leadership styles: A review of the past decade. Tilburg University, Work and Organization Research Centre 6.

Van Vugt, M. R. Hogan, and R. B. Kaiser. 2008. Leadership, followership, and evolution: Some lessons from the past. *American Psychologist* 63 (3): 182-196.

Wilson, R. 2004. Where the elite teach, It's still a man's world. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* 51 (2004): A8.

Wylie, A., J. R. Jakobsen, and G. Fosado. 2007. Women, work, and the academy. *The Barnard Center for Research on Women* 2: 1-17

Yoder, J. 2001. Making leadership work more effectively for women. *Journal of Social Issues* 57 (4): 815-828.

Zemsky, R. 2001. Gender intelligence. *Policy Perspectives* 10 (2): 14.