

CAREER PATHS OF FEMALE CHIEF ACADEMIC OFFICERS
IN THE COUNCIL FOR CHRISTIAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

April L. Moreton, B.M., M.A.

Dissertation Prepared for the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH TEXAS

May 2001

APPROVED:

Ronald W. Newsom, Major Professor and Program
Coordinator for Higher Education
James H. Thames, Minor Professor
N. Barry Lumsden, Committee Member
Michael Altekruise, Chair of the Department of Counseling,
Development, and Higher Education
M. Jean Keller, Dean of the College of Education
C. Neal Tate, Dean of the Robert B. Toulouse School of
Graduate Studies

Moreton, April L., Career Paths of Female Chief Academic Officers in the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities. Doctor of Philosophy (Higher Education), May, 2001, 140 pp., 36 tables, references, 71 titles.

This study examined the career paths of women administrators serving as chief academic officers in Christian colleges and universities which belong to the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU). The CCCU is a professional association of evangelical Christian institutions dedicated to integrating faith and learning. The exploration included each administrator's demographic information; her early, adolescent, college, and graduate school experiences; early vocational experiences; the effect of marriage and motherhood on her career; critical factors she identified as important in achieving her current position; and the importance of spiritual convictions or Christian faith in career decision making. Sixteen of the eighteen identified women holding the rank of chief academic officer agreed to participate in the study.

The typical woman administrator was 50, married, and the mother of one or more children. She most likely had received her education in the humanities, with the terminal degree of choice being a Ph.D. She had served at her current institution for more than five years, but in her current administrative position for less than five. As an adolescent she excelled in the humanities, less so in math and science, and was involved in many extracurricular activities, including music endeavors, leadership, and her local church. She had received the most encouragement from her mother, although both parents expected her to do her best in school. For post secondary education, she had benefited from a mentor, had excelled easily, and had taken no time off between her bachelor's and master's degrees or between her master's or doctoral degrees. Although she had aspired

to teach and received most of her early vocational experience in the professoriate, she had not aspired to be an administrator. As an adult, she had married in her 20's and had children before the age of 30. She had an unusually supportive spouse and believed her marriage to be a key factor in her career success. Her family and professional roles were potentially conflicted and required her to "juggle" her responsibilities. She believed the influence of her mentors, faith influences, and chairing an academic department were critical experiences that had led to her position in administration. Regarding her spiritual convictions and disciplines, she adamantly believed both affect her daily work and personal life.

CCCU women administrators are deeply committed to their Christian higher education callings, highly educated, persistent, spiritually minded, and devoted to their families.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Without a doubt, this project would not have reached fruition without the sincere involvement of many people. To my committee members, and especially Dr. Ron Newsom, I credit patience, constructive criticism, and careful attention to details. Thank you for walking me through this project. Jill Jackson, Kerrie Maddox, and Sandee Smith spent many hours either editing or transcribing. Thank you, ladies, for supporting me during such a critical phase.

To the sixteen women administrators who so graciously gave me their time, insight, honesty, and humor – I would not have had a study without you. Not only did you contribute to my education, you challenged me in the process. If someday I achieve even a portion of your wisdom, I will consider myself blessed.

For the countless prayers offered on my behalf by my immediate family and friends at Dallas Bible Church and Dallas Baptist University, I credit the sustenance to dream, plan, and fulfill such a project.

The hero in this study is undoubtedly my dear husband. Not only did you encourage me to succeed, but you made it possible for me to do so. I will not forget the weekends and evenings you spent alone while I researched, nor the clean home and hot meals that awaited me. You truly exemplify a Christ-like spirit that continues to bless me in every way. I love you, Sam.

Most of all, praise be to God the Father for all He has done on my behalf.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACNOWLEDGEMENTS.....ii

LIST OF TABLES.....vi

Chapter

I.INTRODUCTION.....1

Problem Statement
Purposes of the Study
Research Questions
Definitions of Terms
Delimitations
Assumptions
Significance of the Study

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....8

Traditional Career Paths
Male and Female Career Paths: A Comparison
“Women’s Work”
The Role of Mentors and Networks
Promotion
Obstacles to Advancement
 Early Socialization
 Femininity
 Education
 Marriage and Childbearing
 Tokenism and Authority Issues
 Theological Controversy in Evangelical Christian Higher
 Education
Keys to Advancement
 Education
 Work Ethic
 Mobility
 Political Astuteness
 Experience and Characteristics
Landmark Studies
 *The Life Cycles and Career Stages of
 Senior Level Administrative Women in
 Higher Education*
 Findings
 *Career Paths of Women Administrators
 In Higher Education Institutions: Perceptions
 Of Motivation and Opportunity*
 Findings

Career Paths in Higher Education Administration

Findings

Conclusion

III. RESEARCH DESIGN.....	50
Population	
Interview Guideline	
Field Testing	
Domains	
Demographics	
Family Influence	
Social Influences – High School, College, Graduate School	
Adult Family Influences	
Critical Incidences	
Faith Influences	
Procedure for Collecting Data	
Initial Contact	
Scheduling	
Interviewing	
Follow Up	
Data Analysis	
Reporting the Data	
IV. PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS.....	58
Introduction	
Demographics	
Family Influences	
Social Influences – High School	
Social Influences – College and Graduate School	
Vocational Influences	
Adult Family Influences	
Critical Incidences	
Role of Faith	
V. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	115
Introduction	
Summary	
Discussion of the Findings	
Conclusions	
Recommendations	
APPENDICES.....	127
A. CCCU Member Institutions	
B. Invitation Letter	

C. Interview Guideline

REFERENCE LIST.....135

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1. Characteristics of Women Administrators.....	38
2. Years at Current Institution.....	60
3. Years in Current Position.....	60
4. Age.....	61
5. Undergraduate Degree.....	61
6. Master's Degree.....	62
7. Terminal Degree.....	62
8. Major Fields of Study.....	63
9. Marital Status of Women Administrators.....	64
10. Husband's Education.....	65
11. Husband's Vocation.....	65
12. Adjectives Used to Describe Personality.....	66
13. Mother's Educational Level.....	67
14. Father's Educational Level.....	68
15. Place of Birth and Current Location.....	69
16. Siblings.....	71
17. Childhood.....	72
18. Early Childhood Encouragement.....	73
19. Activities Outside the Home.....	75
20. Parental Expectations Academically.....	76
21. Easy Subjects in High School.....	77

22. Social Status.....	79
23. Opinions of the Feminine Role During High School.....	82
24. Choice of Undergraduate Institution.....	84
25. Easy and Difficult Subjects in College.....	86
26. Number of Years Between Degrees Received.....	89
27. Graduate School Mentors	90
28. Administrative Aspirations.....	94
29. Work Experience In and After Graduate School.....	95
30. Competencies Gained During and After Graduate School.....	96
31. Career Goal and Strategy.....	97
32. First Position in Higher Education Administration.....	98
33. Age at Time of Marriage.....	100
34. Age at Time of Childbearing or Adoption.....	100
35. Critical Incidences Affecting Career Paths.....	109
36. Advice to Women Aspiring to Administration.....	113

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

As of the mid 1990s, women comprised more than half of the U.S. population. Subsequently, more than half of those now enrolled in college are female. According to the American Council on Higher Education (2000) and the National Center for Educational Statistics (2000), women are earning more degrees at all levels than in previous decades. Furthermore, one-third of all faculty are female, and women administrators are gaining more senior-level administrative positions, albeit in the fields of external affairs and student services (Knopp, 1995). Although women continue to be outnumbered by men in chief administrative offices, and although they are usually not employed in academic administration, they have gained considerable ground in recent years. Women now hold more than 16 percent of the chief executive officer positions (Knopp, 1995).

In 1983, Ellen Mentzer Ironside completed a study of career paths of women administrators. In her Association for the Study of Higher Education (ASHE) award winning research, Ironside discovered that many women administrators began their careers outside higher education. Most did not take “career breaks” in which they devoted their time to home and family. Furthermore, the women in her study regarded traditional gender roles much the same way as their male counterparts: important aspects of life but having little to do “with intellectual fulfillment, career aspirations, or even a simple desire to work” (Ironside, 1983, p. 135). Married administrators with dual careers tended to have added anxiety due to intense academic expectations and family needs. Some of

the women in Ironside's study reported that their careers revolved around their husband's careers. Ironside discovered that "purposeful career planning" was the case with most of the women in her study.

Women who have achieved high-ranking positions in higher education usually have done so through nontraditional means (Murrell & Donohue, 1982). In other words, their career paths have differed from those of their male counterparts. Women, in general, have had to balance career aspirations with family and marriage commitments. As a result, their positions as academic deans, vice presidents, and presidents were often obtained later in life.

Historically, women have not encountered leadership opportunities in Christian organizations as readily as men. Due to the influence of tradition and particular biblical interpretation that may be perceived to limit women, leadership equality among women and men has been difficult to achieve (Guastad, 1990). Such is the situation in Christian higher education.

The first woman admitted to a higher education institution, Antoinette Brown Blackwell, received her degree in the mid 1800s from Oberlin College. She then applied for graduate study in the theological department from which she hoped to receive a degree and ordination. Oberlin College allowed her to study, but did not grant her a degree, thus denying her the right for ordination and subsequently a probable role in ministry leadership (Guastad, 1990). Theological differences in Christian institutions regarding female roles may contribute to the lack of women in upper-level leadership roles.

Women administrators serving in Christian institutions may utilize their personal faith in decision-making. If so, the career paths of women in Christian higher education may be slightly different than the career paths of women in secular colleges and universities. For instance, women serving in Christian institutions may not aggressively pursue advancement. Instead, they may interpret opportunities for advancement as divine intervention as it relates to their faith.

Because Christian institutions, generally speaking, rely on a set of norms that reflect their theological convictions, differences from their secular counterparts should be readily identified. For instance, the mission statement of an evangelical Christian institution would probably emphasize the basic purposes of higher education, but may also include ministry and evangelism components as well. Therefore, the choices, opportunities, expectations, and experiences of women serving in Christian higher education may differ simply because they function in a Christian environment.

The Problem

How have women in academic administration reached their upper-level academic positions at evangelical Christian colleges and universities, and how have their career paths and achievements been exemplified?

Purposes of the Study

This study described the career paths of women administrators serving in institutions belonging to the Council of Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU). Career paths were identified by several factors. Factors used to identify career paths

included: demographics, social and vocational influences, critical incidences, and the influence of Christian faith among the administrators.

Research Questions

1. What demographics characterize women administrators serving in the CCCU?
2. What was the first administrative position and latter career path in higher education of CCCU women administrators?
3. What encouragement or discouragement from friends, family, and mentors did each CCCU administrator experience?
4. What critical incidences brought the administrator to her current position?
5. Did the administrator acknowledge her Christian faith as playing a role in her career achievement?
6. In what ways did the administrator acknowledge the role of her faith?

Definitions of Terms

The following definitions applied to this study:

1. Career path – the sequence of events, influences, and characteristics that enabled the administrator to achieve her current position.
2. Demographics – age, marital status, number of children, educational achievements.
3. Social influences – friends, family, and mentor(s) who contributed positively or negatively to the administrator's achievement.
4. Christian higher education institutions – public or private postsecondary

institutions that belong to the CCCU.

5. Critical incidences – important circumstances as defined by the administrator that either impeded or propelled her higher education career development or path.
6. Faith influence – how the administrator’s practice of the Christian faith guided or affected her career path.

Delimitations

The following delimitations applied to this study:

1. The focus was on academic women administrators who have reached the position of Vice President of Academic Affairs or its equivalent in their given institutions, which belonged to the Council of Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU).

Limitations

The following limitation applied to this study:

1. Because of the nature of self reporting, honesty may or may not be characteristic of the information obtained.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made for this study:

1. Because of their association with the CCCU, women administrators in the study were able to describe how their Christian faith affected their achievement.
2. Self-reported perceptions and experiences of these women are truthful and accurate.

Significance of the Study

Women administrators bring a unique perspective to the college and university that can benefit female students. This perspective has been evaluated and analyzed by Carol Gilligan (1977) in her work that culminated in A Different Voice. Though Gilligan's work focused on moral development specifically, it also implies that female students may need different mentoring strategies and different learning and developmental opportunities. Women comprise more than 50% of the collegiate population today (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2000). Their needs, career goals, learning styles, and social positions are often different than those of their male counterparts. Gilligan theorized that women's development differs from men in experiences, sense of self, and/or the bases for moral reasoning. A secondary issue related to student development and the lack of female leadership is that many men in administrative and professorial roles hesitate to mentor women. Sexual harassment is a real concern on university campuses. In addition, men associated with Christian institutions make great efforts to protect their public and ministerial reputations through limited one-on-one involvement with women. Therefore, for female students to be

equally served, it is imperative that women hold decision-making roles within higher education institutions.

Furthermore, women have increasingly become a larger part of the modern work force. Because of this, students – male and female alike – need women role models while attending college; having these role models allows students to better prepare themselves for intellectual development. Many Christian institutions have limited female role models in the form of upper-level women administrators.

Although this study did not focus on the problems of women in ministry and its theological controversy, it was important to note that different views of women's roles in leadership abound. Several foundational issues, however, should be mentioned. One can easily argue for the inclusion of women in decision-making due to the Christian belief that men and women are image-bearers of God – they have equal value in the eyes of God. Furthermore, it is logical to assert that women should hold some form of leadership so that the female gender is represented and mentored effectively. In an age of harassment and misunderstanding, women need educated, dedicated, and wise women to serve as role models (Scanlon, 1997; Gold, 1996; Wright & Wright, 1987). This latter perspective has the potential for reducing tension between male professors/administrators and female students, and vice-versa.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Since its enactment in 1972, Title IX has broadened opportunities for women in higher education. No longer can discrimination play a part in the hiring and promotion of female faculty, staff, and administrators. Yet, nearly thirty years later, women continue to lag behind their male counterparts (Sederberg & Mueller, 1992; Touchton & Davis, 1991; Cullivan, 1990; Etaugh, 1984; Kaplan & Tinsley, 1989). Most females in higher education administration are grouped in lower rank positions, such as director, assistant, or associate, and they receive lower salaries than men (Cullivan, 1990; Tinsley, 1985; Etaugh, 1984; Kaplan & Tinsley, 1989). However, the American Council on Education (2000) reports that the number of female college presidents has risen from 9.5% in 1986 to 19% in 2000. For the typical chief academic officer, the standard remains a Caucasian male with a terminal degree in an academic discipline (Allen, 1984).

American higher education has a rich history of tradition. However, unlike corporate America for instance, its structure is often resistant to change. As a result women, who often do not understand the political framework of higher education, remain unaware and immobile. Cullivan (1990) states that “progress is slow partly because [these] women are being held to a set of traditional criteria and standards which they did not help develop and do not always understand” (p. 13).

In education, men have traditionally made decisions and women have implemented them: faculty and administrators create policy and staff carry out their

decisions (Cullivan, 1990). Although women have long been a part of academia – as students and employees – equal representation for them has been slow. Nevertheless, progress has been made. As students, women have increased from 42% of the overall undergraduate population in 1970 to 56% in 1996 (American Council on Education, 2000). As employees, women served in 52% of staff positions in postsecondary institutions in the fall of 1997 (Roey & Skinner, 2000).

More than half of the executive, administrative, and managerial positions in 1997 were occupied by men with women holding mainly administrative and part-time executive positions (Roey & Skinner, 2000). The American Council on Education (2000) notes that female CEOs have increased from 9.5% in 1986 to 19% in 2000. In 1999, of the over 2 million employees in higher education, 82,127 men occupied executive administrative posts, whereas 65,318 women occupied such posts (Digest of Education Statistics, 1999). Though progress has been made, the number of women holding top-level administrative positions lags behind men (Warner & DeFleur, 1993).

In addition to a low number of women represented in strategic administrative positions, the women who do reach this level often receive lower salaries (Sederberg & Mueller, 1992). Schneider, in the July 21, 2000, issue of *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, reported that women faculty in the California State University system received, on average, 8% less than their male counterparts. In five years of merit pay, men received an average of 12.8% more than women in the same position (Schneider, 2000). The average salary for a woman CEO at a doctoral-granting institution is \$173,036, while a male CEO at a similar institution earns \$204,632. A female chief academic officer at a comprehensive institution earns \$75,870, while a male CAO earns

\$81,072 (Women in Higher Education, 1998). Sederberg and Mueller (1992) report that “the higher the position, the greater the discrepancies between men and women” (p. 9). Women opposing the salary differences do not always blame discrimination. Susan Meisenhelder (Schneider, 2000) stated that the real issue might be structural problems in higher education as opposed to outright discrimination. Merit pay often rewards research over teaching, and because most women focus on teaching, their raises often reflect salary differences.

Because the majority of students enrolled in higher education as of 1999 were female, the need for women in decision-making roles has increased. As demonstrated by Gilligan (1977), women bring a different perspective – a different voice – to the administrative process. This “voice” has the potential to represent female students more thoroughly than traditional hierarchical frameworks. As Stonewater (1987) further clarifies, “Gilligan posits that there are two different, but equally valid, patterns of development. One pattern, which is more characteristic of women, is based on relationships and connectedness; in this pattern, separation is threatening and decisions are most often based on relationships and the resultant ‘ethic of care’” (p. 17). After the enactment of Title IX, numerous studies and articles (Warner, et.al., 1988; Ironside, 1983; Murrell & Donohue, 1982) addressed the role of women in higher education and the need to increase an ‘ethic of care’ through female representation.

Many women believe that policy makers no longer view the matter of women and achievement as an important issue (Kaplan & Tinsley, 1989). Two important essays on American higher education’s future, *To Secure the Blessing of Liberty* by Terrell Bell and *A Memorandum to the 41st President of the United States* by William Friday, do not

address the issue of women in higher education. Furthermore, Kaplan & Tinsley agree that “only when those in positions of authority actually make affirmative action an institutional imperative will the number of women and minorities in administrative positions increase” (p. 20).

In spite of discrimination and lack of interest, women are obtaining top-level administrative posts. Not only are these women unique, but they possess certain characteristics, encounter barriers, and follow career paths that are often different from their male counterparts. As stated above, many leaders in higher education no longer focus on equality for women. The literature reflects this shift. Over fifteen years ago, several important studies (Warner, et.al., 1988; Ironside, 1982; Murrell & Donohue, 1982) explored the career paths of administrative women, but studies in the 1990s have been almost nonexistent. Studies focusing strictly on women chief academic officers are also nonexistent. However, Cejda, Bush, and Rewey (in press) profiled chief academic officers in the CCCU and discovered that 14.3% were female, a lower number than female CAOs in non-CCCU institutions (26.2%).

Anecdotal articles (Hersi, 1993; Cullivan, 1990; Kaplan & Tinsley, 1989; Allen, 1984) and published literature reviews (Scanlon, 1997; Sederberg & Mueller, 1992; Etaugh, 1984) abound, but relatively little original research is recent. In addition to lack of interest, another factor contributing to the lack of recent research on women is the fact that, because men continue to occupy top administrative positions, most research focusing on career paths uses single sex samples (Lumsden, et.al., 2000; Hawk, 1995; Sederberg & Mueller, 1992).

Of even further concern is the lack of research which analyzes the career paths of women administrators in evangelical, conservative, Christian institutions. Much has been written about women in higher education in general and women in ministry, but relatively little about women in Christian higher education. Thorough electronic searches were conducted using ERIC (1966-2000), Sociofile (1963-2000), Dissertation Abstracts (1975-1999), and Psychlit (1983-2000) databases. Descriptors included the following: women, women administrators, career development, career path, mobility, chief academic officer, vice president for academic affairs, Christian institutions, religious institutions, Christian higher education, Christian women, and others.

A search of the literature revealed studies which have focused on broad career paths, “women’s work,” mentoring and networking, promotion, obstacles to advancement, necessary preparation, and examples of how women have succeeded. This review focused on these areas and examined three studies that focused specifically on career paths of women administrators. Though thorough, this search revealed a gap in the literature regarding career paths of women in Christian higher education, women chief academic officers, and the lack of research covering the two topics concurrently.

Traditional Career Paths

Several studies (Twombly, 1986; Cullivan, 1990; Sederberg & Mueller, 1992) have identified the traditional path to administrative careers in higher education. Twombly (1986) identified the professoriate as the most universal entry point to top-level administrative posts. In her study of 898 administrators, Twombly discovered that the chief business officer and chief student affairs positions were ceiling positions.

Individuals serving in academic positions such as department chairs, academic deans, and vice presidents usually have had prior faculty experience (Twombly, 1986).

In one of the earliest studies (Moore, 1983), an “orderly” career path consisted of faculty member, department chair, dean, provost, and president. As a result, if women did not progress through the academic ranks, it was highly unlikely they would be considered for administrative positions. Modeling this study, Sederberg and Mueller (1992) discovered that the ages of women in administration affected their career paths. Women 55 and older often followed Moore’s orderly career path. Women between 40 and 55 focused on professional and personal aspects of their lives equally, and women between the ages of 30 and 40 delayed marriage and family until they established their careers.

In their sample of 394 male and female administrators, Warner and DeFleur (1993) identified two tracks for advancement in higher education. Individuals who attained upper-level academic administrative positions began their careers in academic fields. Those who began in non-academic fields attained a vice presidency level in non-academic divisions, with little crossover between academic and non-academic administration. The researchers also discovered that administrators who began their careers in academic fields also obtained top-level positions. Roughly 39% of the academic deans in Warner’s and DeFleur’s sample had academic backgrounds as opposed to 7% of the deans with non-academic backgrounds.

Obstacles to the “orderly” career path exist for women. One important factor is that women who begin in the professoriate must make crucial choices regarding their personal and professional lives (Hersi, 1993; Sederberg & Mueller, 1992; Woo, 1985). The critical years for obtaining tenure through research, publication, and service to the

institution often coincides with childbearing years and forces women to either choose between equally important goals or sacrifice one at the expense of another (Dublon, 1983).

Male and Female Career Paths: A Comparison

In an effort to generalize to the population, Slimmer (1984) sampled 232 administrators from 118 public and 67 private institutions in order to determine career path characteristics for female administrative aspirants. Using a self-made survey (Women in Higher Education: Characteristics and Employment Strategies), correlation, multiple regression, and factor analysis, the researcher discovered that 38.5% of the respondents began their higher education careers immediately following graduation from college. Differing from their male counterpart's continuous career paths, 45.2% of the respondents noted a personal sabbatical from their careers in order to marry, raise children, or change locations for their husband's career.

However, Louise H. Allen (1984), a Vice President for Academic Affairs in the 1980's, identified from personal experience that male and female career paths as CAO were very similar. She states:

Sex apart, the female vice president for academic affairs has many characteristics in common with her male counterpart. Her career path has been very similar, and the headaches and rewards of her job are quite parallel. Her salary has probably been equalized by now with those of men in similar institutions and positions, and she may very well be, as I am, the highest-paid vice president on her campus. She may actually be more in demand than her male counterparts for off-campus board membership and other activities, since she is rare. (Allen, 1984, p. 10)

She supports Moore's (1983) "orderly" path in that one aspiring to a similar position must seek a terminal degree, gain experience teaching undergraduate and graduate students, write for publication, and accept progressive administrative responsibility.

Barrax (1985) surveyed thirty administrators, equally split between male and female. Her intention was to discover the career paths of both once they achieved similar positions. Using in-depth interviews as the primary form of data collection for her study, Barrax also reviewed each participant's vita for consistency. The researcher discovered that the highest percent (33%) received their first degree in fields traditionally saturated by women (e.g., nursing). However, a shift was noted in that terminal degrees were often obtained in "less sex-typed fields such as higher education administration" (p. 28). Most of the men and women had been in their careers for less than five years, a finding also supported by Murrell & Donohue (1982).

Women (83%) more than men (17%) reported risk taking in their careers, whereas an equal number of men and women reported that possessing the right credentials and serving in organizations proved important. Men and women in Barrax's 1985 study reported that "volunteering and accepting assignments at all university levels" (p. 30) were influential in their career mobility.

The most important difference between male and female career paths was that men maintained continuous employment, whereas women had one or more episodes of unemployment and less loyalty to their work due to family responsibilities (Warner & DeFleur, 1993; Johnsrud, 1991; Bird, 1984).

“Women’s Work”

If one accepts Gilligan’s supposition of “a different voice” and women’s tendency to gravitate to nurturing roles, it is not surprising that the positions women assume in higher education reflect this nurturing orientation. These positions have been coined “women’s work” and often rely heavily on nurturing interpersonal relationships. To some extent, faculty positions fall into this category; teaching has traditionally been a woman’s field, and administration (decision-making) a man’s (Cullivan, 1990; Jones, 1987). Women are expected to be able to teach intuitively, which reflects the natural aspects of mothering (Gold, 1996). Numerous studies report that women are clustered in low-ranking, support-type positions in higher education. Adrian Tinsley (1985) states:

The problem with [these] numbers is that – as we know and as the research confirms – higher education has a pyramidal structure and women are clustered at the bottom of the pyramid. Women are far more likely to be assistants to, assistants, or associates than they are to be directors, deans, vice presidents, provosts, or presidents. Women are more likely to be staff line than line. In college and university administration, the three positions most held by women and by minorities are registrar, librarian, and director of financial aid. Research also tells us that most women administrators do “women’s work” in higher education administration. Women hold the positions in continuing education programs that focus on women or reentry women. Women run the programs that deal with women or minorities as a special constituency, such as women’s studies programs, women’s resource centers, developmental skills centers, and special advising centers. Women serve as deans of professional programs in which students are primarily women, such as nursing, home economics, and social work programs. They do not serve as deans of business, engineering, or technology. Women, in short, are “clustered” or “tracked” within the structure of employment in our profession. (Tinsley, 1985, p. 6)

To this list, Wilson (1990) adds that women are usually involved with remedial teaching, advising, and affirmative action, and Etaugh (1984) adds English, foreign languages, home economics, fine arts, and library science as typical women’s disciplines.

As a result of this “clustering” in female fields and lower-level administrative levels, women are underrepresented in academic administration (Cullivan, 1990). Harvey and Stiff (1985) state that an orderly career path that culminates in academic administration is preceded by tenure and academic promotion. However, women in staff-line positions face uncertain career advancement because no such advancement structure exists for them. Furthermore, women are more likely to serve in student affairs divisions such as the bookstore, health services, student counseling, information office, and public relations (Etaugh, 1984). In some fields, women are not only underrepresented but also overtly discriminated against. Featherman (1993) states, “where financial areas are concerned, women are still seen as less knowledgeable than men” (p. 172). This representation of “women’s work” by women is not necessarily unfortunate. If Gilligan’s supposition is true, women may be more satisfied in careers that support their need for relationships and connectedness (Stonewater, 1987).

The Role of Mentors and Networking

The career path of an aspiring administrator often includes a significant “other” in the field – one who serves as a liason, friend, confidant, motivator, and critic. The literature refers to this significant “other” as a mentor. Entire studies have focused on the role of mentoring, both positive and negative aspects. Wright & Wright (1987) defined a mentor as a “veteran professional who takes an active interest in the career development of a younger professional” (p. 204). Scanlon (1997) further defines the mentor as one who holds a powerful position and offers guidance through setting career goals for the protégé. Women administrator aspirants may also benefit from network mentoring. In

one arrangement, the mentoring relationship includes several different participants and is constantly changing. Information and support are shared between a variety of individuals, thus consisting of “flexible and mutually interdependent patterns” between individuals (Swoboda & Millar, 1986, p.11).

Regardless of the type of mentoring a female administrator experiences, most report that mentoring has played a crucial role in her advancement in higher education administration (Gold, 1996; Hawk, 1995; MaCaul, 1988; Twombly, 1986; Barrax, 1985; Slimmer, 1984; Allen, 1984). The majority of the fifteen women executives who participated in a multiple case study by Hawk (1995) reported that mentoring had played an important role in their career advancement. Mentoring provides an ideal opportunity to break this barrier. The literature from the mid 1970s to the late 1990s confirms that for a qualified woman to reach advanced positions, a mentor or series of mentors is vital (Scanlon, 1997; Wright & Wright, 1987; Swoboda & Millar, 1986).

Women have reported positive and negative experiences with mentors along their career paths. One challenge faced by women is the small number of top-level women in higher education who can adequately serve as mentors (Scanlon, 1997; Gold, 1996; Wright & Wright, 1987). As a result, many women must accept male mentors. Slimmer (1984) reported that 57.6% of her total sample of 188 reported benefiting from mentors, and 20.2% reported having male and female mentors. Unfortunately, men are not always eager to mentor women. One reason is the obvious sexual tension; another is that men often do not view women as capable for upper-level positions. Women who have had the opportunity to work with senior female administrators report that they do not always encounter the best situation either. Bower (1993) reports that one type of female

discrimination has come to be known as the “queen bee” syndrome – where a top female believes there is only room for one outstanding female and others must fight their way to the top.

However, two studies have reported that women have denied the fact that mentoring had any identifiable impact on their academic careers. Woo (1985) surveyed 450 women during the Women in Educational Leadership conference at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, and found that mentors had not played a important role in the participants’ career paths. Similarly, Kuyper (1987) sampled 534 women administrators in Florida institutions and found that though mentoring was mentioned in the literature as vital, the women in her sample gave little importance to its role in their career paths.

In her study of women administrators of Christian colleges and universities, Diaz-Bolet (1999) reported that career advancement and personal development were positive predictors of mentoring. The author sampled 343 women serving in administrative positions at member institutions of the CCCU. Of those sampled, 119 had been mentored and subsequently completed the Alleman Mentoring Scales Questionnaire (AMSQ). Although mentoring affected advancement and development for women, mentoring did not affect career satisfaction. Furthermore, the results of Diaz-Bolet’s study seem to indicate that the administrator’s perceptions of the mentor’s influence contributed the most to the overall relationship.

The literature that deals with career paths often cites mentoring and networking as important means to advancement. Directly related to advancement is promotion.

Promotion

A distinguishable ladder exists within the framework of the internal labor market theory of advancement or promotion. As one performs to an expected standard, he or she can anticipate promotion. However, career paths of women administrators do not always follow a succinct, orderly path. In what ways are they affected by barriers, tradition, experience, and education when it comes to promotion?

Two studies focused on the issue of promotion. Johnsrud (1991) attempted to identify the determinants in promotion outcomes in higher education as they relate to gender. She acknowledged that gender, education, experience, and age are factors that affect advancement, as revealed in the literature. Johnsrud utilized the case study method and analyzed the patterns of promoted individuals over a three-year period (1982-85) at a large, public, research university. What her research discovered was that there were no significant differences by gender in the variables of education obtained, years of experience, age, or race. However, in the outcome of promotion as it related to salary, women received a lower salary increase for their promotions than men. She then conducted global F tests and discovered that gender played a factor only in new jobs.

Overall, Johnsrud concluded that men and women in higher education benefit from education, experience, and age; yet, when all variables are controlled, women fair less well in their promotions than their male counterparts. In addition, the researcher discovered that prior position has a significant effect on women's advancement, when all variables are controlled. When prior position was controlled, Johnsrud discovered that gender was a factor in the promotion opportunities of women. One explanation, according to the researcher, is that women have not been around long enough – they must

start at the bottom rung of the ladder and progress. If, as the literature has suggested, women more frequently take time out for marriage and family, they will be at a disadvantage in the promotion process. Johnsrud is quick to note that discrimination, though difficult to prove, is apparent in the progression to top-level positions. However, her research seems to reveal that a more plausible reason for women's advancement is the lack of continuous employment.

Another study by Sagaria (1988) examined the work histories of 2,896 administrators from a previous study in 1981. Of special concern in this study was the researcher's intentional decision to omit Christian higher education institutions on the basis that such institutions often base their career mobility on "special considerations." Sagaria also excluded the promotion status of presidents because their appointments differ, in her opinion, from the appointments of administrators. The researcher acknowledged that the primary means of advancement was that of position change. Her research was unique at the time in that it studied the career changes of individuals over a two-year period.

In her analysis, Sagaria (1988) discovered that men held 40.0% of academic affairs positions and that women held 48.8% of student affairs positions. She also determined that the women in her sample were highly mobile (33.1% changed positions every two years), a finding that discredits the myth that women prefer consistency in their jobs. Furthermore, men were more likely to change positions within an institution, while women were more likely to change positions between institutions.

While Sagaria studied a sample taken from the 1970's, the effects of affirmative action seem to have been positive for women in higher education. The mobility history of

women during the 1970s revealed that they had succeeded in improving their status. It was difficult to determine, according to the researcher, if institutions promoted women within their organizations as a means to satisfy affirmative action mandates or because of the individual's merit.

Obstacles to Advancement

Most of the literature available has focused on the various struggles women encounter in higher education administration. Several categories emerged: early socialization, femininity, education, marriage and childbearing, personal costs, tokenism, and authority/power issues. Each of these categories contributes to the difficulties women face when seeking advancement to upper-level career paths. Because each affects a woman's career path, they are discussed briefly.

Early Socialization.

In the 1990's there was increased attention to the socialization of girls and boys – in the home and at school. Scientists, researchers, and feminists have purported that there are relatively few differences between boys and girls and that both genders should be treated the same, whether at work (in education) or at play. Whether it is “appropriate” for little girls to play with guns and toy cars and little boys to play with dolls, is not the discussion here. However, this idea speaks to a much greater issue in light of equality for men and women. At the heart, if young girls are given only one socialization path (and likewise, young boys), will not the same restrictions apply to their adult lives?

In her anecdotal article, MaCaul (1988) addressed the fact that children receive their sex-role orientation from parents, siblings, relatives, and friends prior to entering formal education. Therefore, male and female children may see the level of equity played

out in their home long before they ever sense it in public life. MaCaul admits that progress has been made to de-emphasize sex-role stereotypes, yet they still exist in the home and in primary education. This fact is often realized in different expectations for boys and girls. Yeakey, Johnston, and Adkison (1986) support this premise by citing Horner's (1972) finding that most girls will not aspire to "unfeminine" careers, and those who do may suffer anxiety, guilt, and peer pressure. Furthermore, they acknowledge that children learn appropriate sex-role differentiation as early as infancy and that the nuclear family, where sex-roles are taught, may diminish a female's drive for management or leadership-type roles. Sederberg (1992) hypothesized "that intelligent women who were socialized early to consider a wide range of occupational choices are more likely to move into administrative positions than intelligent women who were not socialized to consider a wide range of choices" (p. 10).

In education, this socialization may be as simple as "expecting" boys to perform better in science, and girls to perform better in the humanities. MaCaul believes that a "student's future performance is somewhat predetermined by the fashion in which they are grouped in the initial stages of learning" (p. 232). Life paths are often determined through the courses students take as early as eighth or ninth grade. She suggests that parents and educators remain keenly involved with the issues of equity. Parents should participate in extracurricular and scholastic activities to ensure that issues of equity are presented to students, and allow children the opportunities to choose nontraditional activities that may, in turn, lead to nontraditional professions. Tetreault (1986) believes part of the solution to equity in education and educational career lies in the need to give girls the same educational and subsequent employment opportunities.

Femininity.

As women enter traditionally male-dominated fields, higher education administration included, they bring characteristics to their positions that are, obviously, different than those of their male counterparts. Women, once they reach a top-level position, often find that these characteristics are a detriment to their perceived ability. Hersi (1993), evaluating the career satisfaction of women administrators, reported the Association of American College's acknowledgement that male and female communication styles differ. These differences are most noticeable in the women's speech patterns: higher-pitched voices, greater disclosure, inappropriate smiling, encouragement gestures, and averting the eyes. Unfortunately, women experience a lack of formal authority as a result of these differences (North, 1991). Some of these characteristics support the reason women choose certain roles in higher education. Because they are typically the more nurturing and supportive of the two sexes, they gravitate toward positions in higher education that enable them to use these characteristics to their benefit.

The author noted that women at a recent professional gathering were not acknowledged when they wished to speak, were interrupted, had their comments and suggestions ignored and later credited to a male, and were not assigned tasks when work was distributed. As a result, many women attempted to adopt the leadership and decision-making skills they observed in male counterparts. For example, Schmitt (1994), in an attempt to discern this tendency, noted that most of the early literature focusing on women's advancement actually purported that women adhere to the male model of

leadership. In other words, women must become more “masculine” in order to succeed in a male world.

Even acknowledging differences in abilities based on gender is disturbing to higher education administrator Joan DeGuire North. She commented on the fact that

like some other women in visible, leadership positions, I did not want others to think of me as a woman or WOMAN administrator, so I tried to keep gender out of my frames of reference. Only when faced with overwhelming evidence of being treated differently than [sic] the men who surrounded me did I deal, briefly, with the notion that I was different in gender-related ways from my male colleagues. (North, 1991, p. 44)

Some researchers (Hersi, 1993; Sandler, 1987) believe women speak less in meetings, conferences, etc., with male colleagues as a result of discrimination. North (1991) believes this might be the result of a woman’s ability to listen thoroughly. She does acknowledge that when women speak they are often not communicating with a group that has the ability to listen as intently as women. Unfortunately, the organizational scheme of higher education often values the “talker” more than the “listener,” thus placing women at a disadvantage. North, reflecting on this issue in her career, often debates between the need to be heard and the frustration that, if she speaks up, she will likely be labeled as domineering. In conclusion, North believes the issue raised by femininity often discourages women from administration. She fears that women will choose different careers simply because it will be less of a hassle. And she believes “that we could be witnessing a powerful paradigm shift toward identifying the special and unique contributions women can bring to organizations and away from assuming that male and female administrators operate pretty much the same way – the male way” (p. 52).

Though femininity is often viewed as detrimental to one's career and authority, Allen (1984) boldly states that women should use their femininity when appropriate – as a hostess – for instance. Two studies focused on evaluating types of personalities as they relate to gender. Stonewater (1987) surveyed 250 students at a large university in the Midwest in an attempt to distinguish gender differences as they related to career development. She used the Holland Self-Directed Search Instrument and the Johnson, Coscarelli, and Johnson Decision-Making Inventory. The results of her analysis revealed that gender did affect career development (SDS type revealed a $p < .001$). Women more often than not tested as Social and Conventional types, and men tested as Realistic and Investigative. Stonewater further analyzed her data by comparing gender with style. She discovered that women processed information externally and men processed information internally. Based on her results, she accepted Gilligan's (1983) supposition that women gravitate to careers in which they can utilize relationships and caring for others.

A second study conducted by Street and Kimmel (1999) analyzed sex-role stereotypes held by 321 university administrators in the southeast. They administered the Street and Meek Sex-Role Trait Inventory (SRT) and a demographic questionnaire. Of their sample, 51% were men, 49% women, and the majority (34%) was between the ages of 41 and 50. In addition, 81% were Caucasian. The universities were public institutions with no mention of religious ties. From the factor analysis results, Street and Kimmel concluded that both genders believe most men and women are sex-typed. Women viewed their ideal woman, ideal man, and themselves as androgynous, but men viewed their ideal man and themselves as more masculine. Because the SRT discriminates between different traits, the researchers were able to pinpoint the most prominent trait of each

gender. The traits of Compassion and Deference were labeled as mostly feminine, while the traits of Intellect, Power, and Sexuality were labeled as masculine.

The results of the study revealed that both men and women view intellect as the most ideal trait to possess as an administrator. Men and women who participated in the study stated that they view the opposite gender by traditional norms (women high on the compassion trait and men high on the sexuality trait). When analyzing themselves, the women described themselves as high in the traits of Compassion and Intellect. Men viewed themselves as high in the trait of Intellect. The authors believe their study reveals that, as a whole, administrators support androgynous gender roles, but that among members of the study, sex-role stereotypes remain strong. Furthermore, the fact that sex-role stereotypes remain active implies that policy, hiring practices, and promotion may still affect the advancement of women.

Education.

In contemporary society, education has been considered the key to the American dream. For women administrators, education plays an important role in their career paths. The majority of women holding a vice president or presidential title have an earned doctorate (Ironside, 1983; Murrell, 1982). The fields in which that doctorate is obtained differ. Barrax (1985), in her comparative study of 15 male and 15 female administrators from three universities, found a shift from the field of the first degree obtained to the last degree obtained. The majority of the women (33%) received their first degree in the social, political, or behavioral sciences. For their terminal degrees, less sex-typed fields such as higher education administration were preferred by these women.

For the vice president of academic affairs, the type of education received can be an obstacle. For instance, this review has already established that the typical route to the chief academic officer position is through the professoriate (Cullivan, 1990; Twombly, 1986). Therefore, anyone aspiring to the CAO position should acquire a terminal degree, preferably the Ph.D., in a discipline in which they can move through the professorial ranks. Unfortunately, advanced education for women is still viewed as a luxury – something that is unnecessary for women whose husbands income is the main source of support (Hersi, 1993).

Marriage and Childbearing.

Many factors serve as obstacles in the career paths of women administrators: lack of education or the right type of degree, sex-role stereotype, and discrimination, to name a few. However, the personal lives of women – marriage and family – may serve as the greatest obstacle to top-level administrative positions. Sederberg (1992) boldly hypothesized that being married may serve as a barrier for women administrators. There are a number of reasons for this. First, cultural norms include the expectation that women will manage the home and family, often making it difficult to add a highly demanding career. Second, many women find it difficult to choose between a career and family. If they attempt to have both simultaneously, they often struggle to function at the level that both roles demand (Hawk, 1995; Bird, 1984; Fitzgerald, 1980). Third, many women in higher education admit that a supportive spouse plays a key role in their achievement (Slimmer, 1984). Likewise, the opposite is true. Indeed, many women feel that they would be more successful if they had a “wife” to support them!

In spite of the obvious tension that arises from attempting to manage a marriage, children, and an administrative career, most women administrators are married (Slimmer, 1984), yet younger women tend to delay marriage until their careers are established (Sederberg, 1992). In a study of 600 male and female administrators Bird (1984) discovered that the surveyed women, on average, married younger, had fewer children (than the men in her sample), and earned less in their careers. Women report more often than men that professional responsibilities are more demanding of their time, that they tend to delegate in order to manage career and family, and that they still have the major responsibility for the family. Bird concludes by saying that “having a career, being married, and raising children are extremely demanding roles; women administrators who choose to combine these roles are survivors in a system that does not easily forgive ‘inadequate’ performance in any of these realms” (p. 27).

Hersi (1993) supports this claim by adding that female administrators leave the office to go to work at home: run the household, raise the children, and take care of relatives. Unfortunately, she adds, women who are able to rise to the occasion are often viewed as “overly aggressive, strangely masculine, or a hard-core feminist.” Those women who are not able to perform all of the tasks heaped on them are often criticized for being ‘weak,’ overly consumed with personal concerns to achieve professional mobility and “caught between commitment to family and the workplace” (p. 30). Women often fail to advance, likewise, because their family responsibilities are viewed as a liability by decision-making groups (Johnsrud, 1991; Phillips & Johnston, 1985).

As to childbearing and rearing, many women are choosing to delay or omit this life stage. Schneider’s article in the July 21, 2000, issue of *The Chronicle* reported a

University of Oregon lawsuit involving an assistant professor's claim that she was denied tenure because she took maternity leave. With all professional responsibilities met (publications, merit-pay increases, and contract renewal), the assistant professor identified her maternity leave as the only probable cause of her tenure denial. The lawsuit was settled by the university agreeing to pay the professor \$495,000. Clearly, bias against women and their family responsibilities continues.

In 1985, Lillian Woo studied the leadership issues facing 450 women at the Center for Women in Educational Leadership at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill. She noted, first of all, that women continue to be underrepresented in leadership positions in education. As a result, Woo invited the women in her sample who were interested in advancing in education to take part in exploratory sessions in order to assess the needs and issues these women faced. One participant revealed that marriage was possibly the greatest obstacle women face. Many struggle with the desire to have families *and* careers. Participants grieve over the guilt others impose on them based on their career and family choices, and they find it difficult to impress on outsiders their desire for a career *and* a family. Woo discovered that many of her participants admitted that managing their careers while their children are young is extremely difficult; surprisingly, many believed their dual roles of mother and administrator have not affected their career progress.

The issue of childbearing and academic career was the focus of a study by Marshall and Jones (1990). The researchers utilized a simple random sample of 500 members of the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators, and Counselors (NAWDAC). In the survey, respondents were asked to identify the childbearing sequence

they had employed: 1) had first child, began training, began career; 2) began training, had first child, began career; 3) began training, began career, had first child; or 4) began training, began career, had no children.

The researchers found no effect for institutional size on childbearing sequence, but did find significant effects for the participants' age and career length. Half of the respondents reported having children (N=173). Women who employed the third childbearing sequence (training to career to childbearing) reported the highest salary gains compared to the other three sequences. Likewise, the analysis revealed that women who began their training after their first child was born were less likely to achieve senior administrative status.

Marshall and Jones used qualitative measures to determine the perceived impact of childbearing on their respondents careers. Sixty-three percent believed childbearing had negatively impacted their career. Thirty percent believed childbearing had a positive effect, and 7% believed childbearing had no direct effect on their careers. Of those who perceived negative impacts, "37% cited problems with professional advancement, 26% cited delayed entry into careers, 23% cited limited career options, and 10% cited limited mobility as an obstacle" (p. 535). Overall, the researchers determined that childbearing sequences had no significant effect on women's career development, although a weak correlation existed for women advancing to senior level positions if they had children prior to their training. In conclusion, Marshall and Jones report that

the quantitative data indicate that these women can begin their families when they wish to do so, without permanently falling behind other women administrators. In addition, the qualitative analysis indicates that many women administrators believe the satisfaction of having children outweighs any career problems. The qualitative analysis, however, also indicates that many women administrators with children pay a high personal price in

maintaining their careers. Childbearing responsibilities can limit options and force choices that lead to regret, whichever option is chosen. (Marshall and Jones, 1990, p. 536)

The studies cited above regarding childbearing sequence, responsibilities, and priorities did not delineate whether religious convictions affected the decisions women made regarding this area of their lives. Most of the opinions, struggles, and decision-making options of these women centered on the cultural norms generally expected and accepted by men and women. Including an examination of how one's faith affects this decision-making process is necessary. Regardless of the value system from which the women above operate, it is clear that each pays a high personal cost to achieve her career goals (Hersi, 1993; Kaplan & Tinsley, 1989; Woo, 1985; Dublon, 1983).

Tokenism and Authority Issues.

Tokenism, a term used by Moore (1983), refers to being the "token" female in a male-dominated department who is often appointed in order to satisfy affirmative action requirements, regardless of her competency, experience, or training. In a study conducted by Hawk (1995), one participant related frustration over being the "token" female at conferences and being over-taxed to serve on boards, not because of what she would contribute to the group, but because of her position and gender. Unfortunately, women who achieve positions based solely on their gender have actually achieved very little. Though they have joined the ranks of the men, either in a department, board, or administration, they are often overlooked or ignored in the process of decision-making. It is at this point that women administrators struggle to gain formal authority.

Many women lose authority if they exercise femininity because they are viewed stereotypically by their male counterparts. Lafontaine and McKenzie (1985) identified

three different ways in which women address their lack of formal authority. Some women in leadership positions withdraw from their position, some resign to the fact that they lack authority and avoid situations where authority is needed, and others utilize substitute authority – looking to another in the organization to validate her decisions. There is another category of women who actively struggle for authority in their roles. This category fights for formal authority, encounters great risks with their confrontive behavior, and may be labeled intolerant, demanding, over-aggressive, or domineering. Whether they obtain their position as a result of merit or through tokenism, authority is a concern for many women administrators. Similarly, tokenism is detrimental to the individual and to women as a whole (Swoboda & Millar, 1986).

Theological Controversy in Evangelical Higher Education.

In 1999, Marti Watson Garlett conducted a study evaluating the effects of gender-related denominational doctrine, scriptural interpretations, and/or the patriarchal history of the church on women's career advancement in higher education. Specifically, she wanted to determine if women had more or less opportunities for advancement at Christian colleges or universities. To determine this, Garlett reviewed the doctrines and/or policies related to women in member institutions of the CCCU and evaluated the catalogs of member institutions from 1975 through 1995 to determine if an increase in female leadership was evidenced. She then sent a Likert scale survey to 25% of the male and female administrators in the CCCU institutions and conducted interviews with 24 female faculty members. At the end of her study, Garlett stated that women do indeed face additional career impediments, such as discrimination based on theological interpretations, in evangelical Christian colleges that they do not face or encounter in secular institutions.

Interestingly, Twale (1992) stated that women often had more possibilities for advancement at private, religiously affiliated schools. However, these schools were possibly all female or all Catholic schools where nuns composed the majority of administration (Featherman, 1993). Other studies (Sagaria, 1988) deliberately excluded religiously affiliated schools from their career path studies because the researchers recognized that special considerations for advancement often control female mobility. Christian colleges were first viewed as “members of a religious order and secondly as members of the academic labor market” (p. 312).

Cejda, et.al. (in press) affirmed some characteristics of female administrators found in past literature. Most (92.9%) of the CAOs serving in CCCU institutions are married, though the researchers do not note what percentage of these are women and married. The majority of CAOs held doctorates, with education, the humanities/fine arts, and social sciences the most represented fields. The majority obtained the position of CAO after serving as a Dean or faculty member.

Keys to Advancement

Directly related to the obstacles that women face are the issues that tend to promote them in their quest for higher education leadership. Education, a strong work ethic, mobility, political astuteness, commitment, experience, and personal characteristics influence advancement.

Education.

A terminal degree is an increasing necessity for female upper-level administrators. Lack of education in some areas of higher education often reinforces the

glass ceiling. For women aspiring to academic administration, the Ph.D. is the norm (Sederberg, 1991; Twombly, 1986; Allen, 1984). Recent literature suggests that the field in which a Ph.D. is obtained can serve as a hindrance or advantage to the female administrator. Barrax (1985) reported that the women in her study received their first degrees in sex-typed fields (such as nursing), but shifted to broader fields (such as higher education administration) to receive their terminal degrees. For women seeking academic administration positions, the field in which they receive their terminal degree is crucial. Academic vice presidents are expected to be scholars in their fields and peers to the faculty. Allen (1986) encourages would-be Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs to “remember that you’re an academic, and make others remember it by teaching, writing, and speaking on academic topics” (p. 13). To do this, they must have advanced study in specific fields, engage in research, actively publish, and remain current in their fields throughout their administration.

Work Ethic.

Top-level women administrators report that a diligent work ethic helped them succeed. Hopson (1995), reflecting on a relationship prior to her appointment as Vice President for Academic Affairs, states that her mentor “taught [her] that for a woman...it was difficult to break through ceilings and that [she] had to expect...to be willing to work twice as hard, not complain, and to assert [herself] at an appropriate time to show [she] had the ability to get things done” (p. 3). Allen (1984), also a former Vice President for Academic Affairs, states that women should find a personal operating style and stick to it (p. 13). Barrax (1985) identified several characteristics of successful women administrators in her review of the literature. Ambition, self-confidence, career-

mindedness, objectivity, aggressiveness, and interpersonal and communication skills are important traits of these women.

Mobility.

In the past, women's advancement was slower than that of their male counterparts due to a perception that they were less mobile. In higher education, mobility occurs "via movement through fixed positions, a series of appointments with increasing levels of responsibility" (Ost & Twale, 1989, p. 24). For dual-career families (Ezrati, 1983) and women aspiring to administration (Kuyper, 1987), geographic mobility is an important factor for academic success.

Once they have completed their training, women's opportunities are often limited due to inbreeding policies and the fact that they cannot relocate due to their husband's employment (Ezrati, 1983). Kaplan & Tinsley (1989) interviewed women attending the HERS/Bryn Mawr Summer Institute for Women in Higher Education and found that lack of mobility was often cited as an obstacle. Dublon (1983) also cited that mobility played a key role in advancement in her study of 91 women administrators. Therefore, the literature reveals that women aspiring to administrative positions must consider mobility issues in their career planning.

Political Astuteness.

Being aware of the political climate is a necessity for career advancement (Scanlon, 1997; Tinsley, 1985). Allen (1984) advises women to "learn to play the game of campus politics well; practice finding out where the informal communication/decision network lies (which may be quite outside the published organizational chart) and learn to use it constructively" (p. 14). The HERS/Bryn Mawr College Summer Institute for

Women in Higher Education Administration operates on three assumptions as it seeks to educate women. One of these assumptions directly addresses the political arena of higher education. The Institute acknowledges that “careers in higher education unfold in institutions that have relatively rigid norms and traditions, and that the more fully a woman understands her institution’s agendas, organizational structures and political processes, the likelier it is that she will achieve” (Tinsley, 1985, p. 5). In spite of the administrative positions women have achieved, higher education continues to be male-dominated. As a result, women must be keenly aware of the political climate of their working environment and use this knowledge to their advantage.

Experience and Personal Characteristics.

Although the above mentioned factors aid in advancement for women administrators, experience, or lack thereof, may be the greatest preparation factor for women seeking to advance their career path. Other factors simply cannot substitute for hands-on experience in one’s field. Allen (1984) reports that women aspiring to the Academic Vice President role should continually accept progressive administrative responsibility, teach, write, and read extensively. Gradually accepting greater challenges and responsibilities across many areas is also of benefit in one’s career path (Twombly, 1986).

As for characteristics of women administrators, the descriptions abound. Orderly career paths, as opposed to disorderly, have been explored as a means to advancement and satisfaction in higher education administration (Sederberg, 1992). The following table lists many of the qualities women administrators possess as represented in studies

by Powney (1997), Sederberg (1992), Wilson (1990), Mann and Smith (1990), Dublon (1983), Brown (1990), Jones (1987), Woo (1985), Barrax (1985), and Slimmer (1984).

Table 1

Characteristics of Women Administrators

Willingness to accept risks	Willingness to accept added responsibility
Possessed administrative skills	Willingness to work long hours
Knowledge of fiscal operations, Policies, and procedures	Possesses a strong inner need for knowledge and achievement
Availability for travel Dedication to career advancement	Ability to formulate goals Political knowledge
Availability to be mobile	Demonstrated scholarship
High energy	Interest in the university as a whole
Appropriate networking	Effective time management skills
Committed to personal preparation	Not married, or married with older children
Ability to work with men	Flexibility and resourcefulness
Dual roles of career woman and Mother viewed as realistic	Prefers to share household responsibilities with partner
Self confidence	Objectivity
Aggressiveness	Involvement in professional organizations

Landmark Studies

As mentioned earlier, relatively few studies have examined the career paths of women administrators recently. Only a few have examined a particular aspect of the topic within Christian colleges and universities, and to date none have examined the career paths of female chief academic officers in Christian colleges or universities. However, three projects conducted in the 1980s have served as springboards for subsequent anecdotal articles and narrower research studies. Patricia H. Murrell and Wyveta G. Donohue (1982) examined the life cycles and career stages of senior level women administrators in higher education. Ellen Mentzer Ironside (1983) explored the career

paths, perceptions of motivation, and opportunities for women administrators in higher education. Warner, Brazzell, Allen, Bostick, and Marin (1988) conducted a study of the career paths of higher education administrators. The work of these researchers, because it contributes directly to the study at hand, will be discussed specifically.

The Life Cycles and Career Stages of Senior-Level Administrative Women in Higher Education.

Murrell and Donohue (1982) purposed to determine if age-related factors and extra-age-related factors influenced the career paths of women administrators. The researchers used an intensive interview format to collect data and performed a content analysis that grouped, tabulated, summarized, and discussed the interview topics. The interview guide was field tested with 10 female students over the age of 30 who were attending a state university. Murrell and Donohue identified 48 women who served as senior-level administrators at four-year, coeducational, state-supported institutions in the U.S. Of the women identified, 5 were presidents, 1 was a chancellor, 3 served as provost, 30 were vice presidents, 2 were assistant provosts, and 7 were vice chancellors. Forty-four women agreed to participate in the study. To determine age-related factors for the women in the study, Murrell and Donohue summarized each woman's interview "and examined the changes made in the life of that subject that could be identified as a transition" (p. 23). In order to group transitional periods, the researchers compared the apparent transitions of the participants and grouped these changes by age. Each transitional period was subsequently identified by age-related factors.

Findings.

Once career paths of the participants were identified, the only consistent characteristic of all the women was their college attendance during their late teens and/or early 20's. After this period in their lives, the women often chose between three occupations: furthering their education, homemaking, or working. The majority (64%) of the participants entered the work force after obtaining bachelor degrees, 25% furthered their education, and 11% chose to be homemakers. For those who furthered their education, most received terminal degrees between the ages of 25 and 32. Many of the women who entered the work force after undergraduate study did so in the field of education – elementary, secondary, or higher education. Twenty-one percent entered fields other than education. In conclusion, the researchers did not find a single career path that represented all 44 of their participants. However, 89% of the women interviewed had served as higher education administrators prior to obtaining their senior-level posts.

Student and Academic Affairs were most represented by the participants. Forty-five percent served as Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs and 27% served as Vice Presidents for Student Affairs. The majority of women serving as VP for Academic Affairs were between the ages of 40-49, while the women serving as VP for Student Affairs were between the ages of 50-59. Specifically, the majority (40%) of women serving as VP for Academic Affairs began their careers as students furthering their education, while 25% began careers in elementary and secondary education. Twenty-three percent of the women serving as VP had also served as assistant president, or acting, assistant, or associate vice president. Most (59%) transitioned to their senior-level

positions within their current institutions. For all positions, women had been in their positions less than five years and had a mean age of 46.

The participants' educational backgrounds varied. All possessed baccalaureate degrees. Twenty-seven of the 44 participants had obtained doctor of philosophy degrees, with 82% obtaining some type of terminal degree. All academic vice presidents in the study held doctorates. Twenty-five different fields of study were represented by the degrees held by the participants, the most represented fields being higher education administration, history, and philosophy.

Because this study focused on age-related factors that affected the participants' career paths, much discussion was given to the characteristics of each identified age category. The researchers discovered that many of the women in the study had worked between 50 to 85 hours per week and for personal satisfaction. If married, they had experienced at least one divorce. Over half of the participants were invited to accept their positions by presidents, and most who served as senior officers had experience in middle-level administrative positions. Murrell and Donohue reported that women administrators were affected by age-related factors throughout their careers. Factors most cited included personal time commitment, current marriages, relationships with children, parental relationships, and personal values.

Of the 44 women interviewed, 19 were currently married and 12 had never married. The researchers reported that married women often interrupt their careers to raise children and relocate for their husband's vocation. Although most (70%) of the participants had a mentor, only 11% had served as one. Of those mentored, 87% percent of the participants had male mentors. Interestingly, the women in this study, when

compared with the average American female with a Ph.D., came from families where the mother and father had less education than their daughter. All women in the study, however, dreamed of being college educated.

In conclusion, the authors state that women's career advancement is enhanced if they hold a Ph.D., attain some form of mid-level management in higher education, increase their visibility among presidents, and determine early in their lives to have a specific life style. Because of its autobiographical nature, Murrell and Donohue report that the findings relied heavily on the participant's willingness to share personal information. Therefore, it was not always comparable for all participants. Furthermore, this study is limited in its findings because it did not include religiously affiliated institutions or any particular emphasis on faith in the career decision-making of the women.

Career Paths of Women Administrators in Higher Education Institutions: Perceptions of Motivation and Opportunity.

Ellen Mentzer Ironside (1983) identified the problem in her study as the relatively few women in administrative leadership and sought to identify causal factors. Her approach, however, was positivistic: she focused on women who had achieved senior-level positions so that success, as opposed to failure, would serve as the motivating factor for women to share their experiences. She identified three mileposts for women: as students, as faculty, and as administrators. At the time of her study, Ironside recognized that women were forced to operate in a society that inhibits their aspirations in a way that men do not experience. Women often face internal (within higher education) and external (societal) barriers to leadership advancement. Her grand tour question focused on

identifying women who had reached upper-level administrative positions and more specifically, how they obtained their positions. She used a structured interview to probe the background and early years, education, work history, and influence of family, friends, and mentors of 30 women holding upper-level administrative positions in 25 different North Carolina four-year higher education institutions. The institutions sampled in her study included public and private, with no mention of any affiliated with religious denominations.

A two-hour, in-depth interview was used. Once the interviews were completed, the researcher used recurring themes and variations as a means to describe the career paths of the participants. She reported the findings across domains that paralleled the interview.

Findings.

Unlike other studies cited in this review, Ironside related that the women in her sample reported almost continuous employment from the time of their degree attainment. Marriage and motherhood did not generally interrupt this pattern. Of the 30 women interviewed, only three had taken “career breaks” to raise a family. Careers obviously held important value for these women. The women reported that supportive and industrious parents (including a working mother), early development of personal goals, unusual social and intellectual skills, encouragement of mentors, and economic necessity provided the foundation for career ambition. For these women, achievement was defined as something different than the traditional role of wife and mother, although the latter dimension was not denied. They viewed marriage and family in a similar fashion as their male counterparts: important, but separate from “intellectual fulfillment, career

aspirations, or even the simple desire to work” (p. 135). Furthermore, many of the women achieved their positions without the benefit of the typical academic career path.

All of the women interviewed for this study had enjoyed relatively good health. They possessed high energy, a positive attitude, and were active mentally and physically. Of the 24 initial marriages represented in the sample, not all remained intact. The quality of these marriages played a key role in the career path of the woman. The most successful (in terms of length) marriages often included spouses who gave high levels of support or at least fully accepted their wives’ personal goals. Ironside reported that one of her participants frankly stated that “it was apparent early in our marriage that I was not going to be happy as a housewife, and my husband both understood and appreciated that” (p. 136). Eight of the women interviewed were married to men with doctorates, three were married to men with graduate degrees, and the remaining women’s husbands held bachelor’s degrees. Of the eighteen married women, eight had spouses working in higher education. It is clear that these women were not only high achievers themselves, but were married to high achievers as well. All the women acknowledged that balancing a career, marriage, and family was a difficult task.

Most of the married women reported that their careers revolved around their husband’s careers. Only after the husband’s careers had reached an obvious level of success did the career of the wives become of equal importance. Ironside reported that most of the women in her study did not indicate a purposeful career path. The majority (two-thirds) began their careers outside higher education. Several had worked part-time initially or had taken time off to finish degrees. Many reported that personal energy rather than “buying a ticket” good for the “ride” was the key to achievement.

The participants “possessed a wide range of engaging personal qualities – from warmth to wit, to sensitivity and patience, to discipline and balance” (p. 177).

Professionally, they had unconsciously found ways to further their careers. Ironside reports that creating support systems and learning how to position themselves for opportunity helped further the participant’s careers. Oftentimes, creativity in career strategies enabled the women to achieve their goals in spite of societal limitations.

The general profile of the women administrators in North Carolina included: being married, having two to three children (or none at all), having a Ph.D., having an undergraduate degree in field of humanities, being about 50 years of age, and being Caucasian. The typical administrator had grown up in a family of hard working parents and generally fulfilled her parent’s expectations of moral character, discipline, and school achievement. Administrators’ mothers were often employed outside the home and had been involved in community activities. The woman administrator achieved in many different areas while in school. She was most likely involved in sports and respected by teachers and peers. She attended college, but usually on scholarship and while working part-time. However, graduate school did not follow undergraduate work until 10 years later. Generally, administrators married after receiving their undergraduate degrees and continued working through the birth of their children. Most of the women in administration began in the teaching profession and gradually moved to administrative leadership through accepting various assignments within the university. Mentoring had been an important factor and involved male mentors rather than females. Most of the women reported that they encountered no insurmountable obstacles in their career achievement other than oversights and irritations not associated with discrimination.

In conclusion, Ironside focused on the importance of early role models for women's career path development. Equal early socialization and the freedom to challenge stereotypes proved helpful. This study brought to light the struggle that men and women face when trying to converge professional and personal lives in a society that provides little support or creativity for the "combined venture" (p. 185).

Career Paths in Higher Education Administration

In the introduction to their study, Warner, et.al. (1988) reiterate that women have gained positions of leadership in higher education over the past fifteen years. However, this progress has not been in all types of institutions or across all departments. Therefore, this research team conducted a national survey of administrators at or above the level of dean. The purpose of their study was to determine if barriers existed to higher education administration for women. Their sample consisted of 319 male administrators and 75 female administrators. A 49% response rate to a mailed survey was obtained.

Findings.

Warner, et al., reported that 57% of the women and 90% of the men were currently married. However, a large percentage (33%) of the women in the study had never married. Married female administrators were married to male professionals, but male administrators were more likely to be married to someone classified as "working at home." Women administrators were also more likely to be divorced. Specifically, women viewed getting a late start in their careers as a barrier. This may be due in part to the high priority placed on family by women at a crucial time for their career advancement. Thirty-nine percent of the women placed family before their careers, while only 23% of the men did so. Likewise, women are more likely to place their spouse as top priority

than men. The authors report, however, that neither of these findings reached statistical significance.

Professionally, women were more likely to receive their doctorate in education, while men received their highest degree across disciplines. Over two-thirds of the administrators serving in academic administration had earned their doctorates in the physical sciences. Less than half of those who received their terminal degree in education serve in academic administrations. Therefore, the authors concluded that the field in which one receives her terminal degree serves as a barrier for academic administrators. The lack of women in academic administrative positions may be a result of the fact that many receive their degrees in education. Warner, et.al. found that those with faculty experience (55%) were more likely to hold administrative positions at universities and attain the highest administrative position as well as in academic dean positions. In addition, women in the sample were more likely to hold lower-level positions and be employed at community colleges than their male counterparts.

From previous research, the researchers identified the barriers that pose the most difficulty for women seeking leadership positions in higher education. The barriers identified included: the way in which men and women enter higher education administration; individuals' perceptions and experiences of barriers; and the ranking of individuals' relevant life roles. Each of these barriers was then probed in their sample of administrators. Both sexes (57% of the male, 61% of female) reported being recruited into higher education administration. However, women who were non-academic administrators were much more likely to have sought out their positions than those in academic positions. Both men and women administrators reported a lack of professional

involvement, lack of strong sponsor, and racial discrimination as barriers to advancement. Both viewed a lack of diversity in administrative experience and desire for geographic mobility as general barriers. Almost half of the women reported the lack of mentoring as a barrier.

In conclusion, the Warner study identified several barriers to higher education administration. They sampled male and female administrators to determine if these barriers posed any threat to female advancement. Though the women in their study identified specific issues that did not advance their careers, most did not reach statistical significance.

Conclusion

Much has been written on women administrators and women's roles in the church and ministry. Little has been written combining the two. Women have been underrepresented in upper-level leadership positions in secular institutions. Over the past twenty years, they have made progress in obtaining top-level leadership positions in higher education. In secular higher education, women continue to be a minority. Affirmative action and the women's movement have aided women's progress. The research related to career issues for women administrators identifies factors that affect, negatively and positively, their progress. In addition, the research gives insight as to factors that may increase a woman's advancement in higher education administration.

Women have learned to compete and hold comparable positions in a male-dominated society. They have made personal sacrifices to obtain their positions. At times, they have chosen between equally satisfying lifestyles in order to pursue administrative

careers. Marriage, family, late-starting careers, lack of appropriate education and credentials, and lack of support often handicap the administrative aspirations of women.

For women in the church, leadership roles have also been slow to evolve. Many traditions encourage female leadership; many do not. Some encourage leadership in the church to an extent. Some theologians and church leaders believe parachurch organizations, such as Christian higher education, are extensions of the church and should hold to the same guidelines established for women in the church. Others view parachurch organizations as separate entities. Regardless, women in Christian higher education hold leadership positions. Some are CEOs of their organizations. How have these women achieved their positions in spite of a general lack of opportunity and the influence of conservative, evangelical Christian theology, which in many denominations defines the role of men and women differently, and therefore, limits access by women to roles traditionally described as appropriate for men? What role has their faith played in their achievement? These questions are unanswered in the literature.

Currently 18 women hold the position of senior academic officer in a CCCU institution. Studying their career paths adds insight to the literature, knowledge to leaders in the field, and may add inspiration for younger women.

CHAPTER III

METHOD AND PROCEDURES

Research Design

Because the research problem dealt primarily with perceptions and intuitions regarding career paths, critical incidences, and the influence of Christian faith, a qualitative approach was necessary. Therefore, to fulfill the purposes of this study, a qualitative, field study approach was utilized. Important to this process, a qualitative design allowed the research to evolve as data were collected and analyzed. Furthermore, qualitative research is inductive, rather than deductive, and utilizes assumptions that are particular to qualitative designs, nothing is established a priori (Creswell, 1994).

Qualitative methodologies focus on exploring, explaining, and describing in order to understand, develop, or discover (Marshall, et.al, 1999). This study did not draw upon, or seek to test, a specific theory for several reasons. First, an established theory does not exist for women administrator's career paths serving in Christian higher education. Second, identifying a theory would have "prevented the researcher from seeing events and relationships that don't fit the [chosen] theory" (Maxwell, 1996, p. 36). Furthermore, "in a qualitative study, one does not begin with a theory to test or verify" (Creswell, 1994, p. 94). The methodology employed in this study was similar to narratives - "text data that provides rich descriptions of particular events, situations, or personal histories" (LeCompte, 1999, p. 86).

The purpose was to explore and describe the career paths of women administrators, describing their professional backgrounds, education, experience, and

beliefs in an effort to infer if any commonalties existed. In-depth interviews – also characteristic of qualitative research – were best used in order to gather data that were autobiographical in nature. Specific control was exercised in that interviews were structured. In this process, patterns emerged.

Population.

The population for this study included women administrators serving as chief academic officers, either in the role of Vice President for Academic Affairs, Academic Deans, or Provosts, in institutions belonging to the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU). Member institutions were obtained from Peterson's Christian Colleges and Universities (1999).

Over 90 American Christian colleges and universities are associated with the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU). Founded in 1976, the CCCU's mission is to serve and strengthen Christian Higher Education. The Council consists of colleges and universities devoted to a Christ-centered evangelical education that crosses denominational lines. Any school seeking membership in the CCCU must be a four-year college or university in North America basing its curriculum on the arts and sciences. In addition, the mission of the school must be to integrate the Christian faith with each academic discipline. Faculty and administrators must possess a personal relationship with Jesus Christ.

Because the Council of Christian Colleges and Universities adheres to Christian principles and provides a variety of religiously recognized institutions, it served as the population from which women administrators were compiled. Furthermore, because women continue to be underrepresented in Academic Affairs in all forms of higher

education, those women exercising leadership as Academic Vice President, Academic Dean, or Provost within the CCCU were targeted.

Female CAOs were contacted at CCCU institutions and invited to participate in the study. Web sites and catalogs of CCCU institutions reported sixteen women as holding the title of Vice President of Academic Affairs or the equivalent. This small sample loaned itself to a thorough qualitative analysis and was ideal for providing thick description (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994) of each woman's career path.

During the course of interviewing, two additional CAOs were identified. Of the eighteen newly identified female administrators serving in CCCU member institutions, sixteen agreed to participate in the study.

Interview Guideline.

Because the current study focused, in addition to facts, on personal interpretation, feelings, and nuances about one's career process, in-depth personal interviews were conducted. The interview goal, aside from obtaining the needed data, was to provide an atmosphere in which participants openly shared personal information. Thus, flexibility in the interviews was allowed so that it was conversational and comfortable. Participants were allowed to provide spontaneous information throughout the interview, although a structured interview guide was utilized.

The interview guide relied heavily on the work of Ironside (1983) in that it used a series of structured questions that allowed for consistency across interviews, yet freedom to diverge in question sequences and wordings. Approximately 40 percent of the questions included in the interview guideline were interpretative in nature, the remaining dealing specifically with facts.

Field Testing.

In an effort to evaluate the interview guideline, it was pre-tested in the field with two female administrators at a Christian institution. Once interviewed, the participants were asked to identify any interview questions that they felt uncomfortable answering. No questions causing discomfort were identified.

Domains.

Eight domains were included in the interview guideline and are outlined below. Each domain included 2 to 10 questions and contributed to the general and specific career path of each participant. Again, each domain was derived from the work of Ironside (1983) with two additional domains: critical incidences and faith influences. The latter domains distinguished this study from counterparts in that they addressed the role of Christianity in each participant's career path.

Demographics: Name, title, institution, years at current position, age, education, major, marital status, husband's vocation, and number of children were the focus of this domain. It emphasized the foundation of the career path and facilitated interaction on "easy" topics before proceeding to more personal issues.

Family Influences: This domain focused on the influence of the participant's mother and father, area in which she grew up, siblings' influence, and early aspirations. It is widely accepted in sociological and psychological circles that one's early influences affect later achievement.

Social Influences – High School, College, Graduate School: Divided into two separate sections, this domain sought to establish areas of achievement and struggle, both academically and personally. It attempted to identify mentors, social interactions,

decision-making and choices, and motivation for advanced degrees. This section of the interview provided insight in to how and why the administrator achieved her position.

Vocational Influences: Whether the administrator began in higher education immediately after graduate school, or “fell into” her academic role from another vocation, was the focus of this section. The process of Christian ministry vocation is often eclectic in nature in that it is often acceptable to move between very differing positions. For instance, did the administrator in the CCCU institution train specifically for a career in Christian higher education, or did she begin as a Christian Education Director of a local church or parachurch ministry?

Adult Family Influences: If married, the role of wife and mother affects the perspective and career path of any female. However, it may *greatly* affect the perspective and career path of a Christian female. This is evidenced by the controversy of women in Christian leadership as described in texts such as Women in Ministry (1989) edited by Clouse and Clouse. An extreme traditional viewpoint purports that women serve as homemakers as their primary occupation. A male leadership viewpoint purports that women have opportunities for ministry and career so long as they are subject to male leadership. Schaller (1982) bemoans the fact that role identity and sexual stereotypes often hinder effective ministry. This domain sought to probe these issues in the life of each participant. Marriage and family, as well as managing these roles with an academic career, was investigated.

Critical Incidences: This domain, consisting of two questions, allowed the participant to identify those life experiences, in her interpretation, that greatly affected her career path.

Faith Influences: This distinguishing domain probed the role Christianity played in the administrator's career path. It was assumed that, because of their identification with a CCCU institution, each had a personal relationship with Jesus Christ and utilized this relationship in their decision-making.

Procedures for Collecting Data

Initial Contact.

Once identified, each potential participant was contacted by letter and invited to participate in the study. The letter explained the research, its significance, and the role of participants. Each participant was briefed on how the interview was to be conducted, the length of the interview, and the types of questions to be expected. The researcher asked permission to tape-record the interview for data analysis. The letter also stated that the researcher planned to contact the potential participant via telephone within two weeks to confirm her participation, answer any questions, and schedule a phone interview at the participant's convenience. In addition, a resume and/or curricula vita was requested of each participant in order to verify information obtained in the interviews.

Scheduling.

Interviews were conducted via phone and were tape-recorded. Phone interviews were identified as the most personal and effective method of soliciting information second only to in-person interviews. Participants resided in different areas of the country; therefore, it was necessary that interviews be conducted by phone. Each approximately one-hour interview was scheduled at the participant's convenience in the follow-up

phone contact. No limitations were placed on the participant: the interview was allowed to take place either during business hours, evenings, or weekends.

Interviewing.

The researcher as interviewer in this study had interviewing experience for multiple purposes in several different scenarios. Several years were spent interviewing college students for ministry-related employment. Thorough interviews with administrators ranging from Chairmen to Vice Presidents were conducted as part of an internship at Dallas Theological Seminary. In her current role, the researcher interviewed faculty and staff members for biographical publications. In order to add consistency across interviews, the researcher conducted each interview.

Data Analysis

Each taped interview was transcribed and the researcher reviewed the data for any needed elaboration or follow-up with participants. Information from each domain was synthesized for themes and variations (Ironsides, 1983). Each tape-recorded interview was transcribed to a written form and categorized based on each of the interview domains. A content analysis, in which the data were reduced to these identified patterns and categories, was performed so that dominant themes and consistencies emerged. These themes and consistencies were subsequently discussed (Creswell, 1994; Murrell, 1982).

Reporting the Data

Information from the eight domains once synthesized and evaluated was reported through the use of descriptive text and percentages. The researcher was specifically looking for consistency and divergence among participants as it related to their career paths.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF FINDINGS

Introduction

This study explored the career paths of women administrators serving in chief academic leadership positions at Christian colleges and universities. The data are presented in sections corresponding with the interview guideline that guided the data collection. Seven sections – Demographics, Family Influences, Social Influences (High School), Social Influences (College and Graduate School), Vocational Influences, Adult Family Influences, Critical Incidences, Faith Influences – present the information obtained during a one hour personal interview with the administrator. The chapter concludes with a brief summary.

This study sought to answer general questions regarding the participants' career paths, but also explored experiences the administrators found especially critical in obtaining their leadership roles and the role faith played in their career development. The Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU) consists of over 100 schools committed to evangelical, faith-integrated higher education, and the CCCU provided the population from which to gather data. At the time of data collection, sixteen women were identified from the catalogs of CCCU institutions as holding the title of chief academic office at their given institutions. Flexibility was allowed, for instance, in the case of a female administrator with the title of Vice President of Academic Affairs, where a male held the position of provost. Furthermore, because titles and positions vary from

campus to campus, the group of women in this study represented the majority of female CAO's in CCCU institutions.

Each administrator was sent a letter in October, 2000 that explained the research and invited them to participate. Interviews were subsequently scheduled and data were collected in November and December of 2000. In the course of interviewing administrators, two recently appointed chief academic officers were identified. Of the eighteen newly identified female administrators, sixteen agreed to participate in the study culminating in a response rate of 89%. Another CAO was identified after data collected was completed. As is characteristic of qualitative, ethnographic research, much information was obtained that did not necessarily pertain to the given enquiry. Percentage data, when applicable, reflect those portions of information directly related to the interviewer's question. To further conceptualize the nuances of the administrator's responses, information was coded via a qualitative analysis software program.

Demographics

The first interview section of this study gathered information relative to each administrator's age, years at institution and in current position, marital status, number of children, education, husband's vocation and education, and adjectives each administrator used to describe herself.

Years of Service.

This section identified how long each administrator had been employed by her institution and how long she had served in her current position. The majority of

administrators had been at their given institution more than five years and in their current position less than five years. See Table 2 and Table 3 below.

Table 2

Years at Current Institution (N=16)

Years at Current Institution	N	%
<5 Years	6	38
>5 Years	10	62
Total	16	100

Table 3

Years in Current Position (N=16)

Years at Current Institution	N	%
<5 Years	15	94
>5 Years	1	6
Total	16	100

Age.

Ten-year increments were used to categorize each administrator. The 40-50 age range was the most represented group. See Table 4 below.

Table 4

Age (N=16)

Age	N	%
30-40 Years	2	12
41-50 Years	8	50
51-60 Years	6	38
Total	16	100

Education.

This section of the demographic profile identified the degrees each administrator earned. In addition, major fields of studies were included for each degree. All sixteen women held bachelor degrees with 81% possessing Bachelor of Arts degrees. Less represented was the Bachelor of Science degree. See Table 5 below.

Table 5

Undergraduate Degree (N=16)

Undergraduate Degree	N	%
Bachelor of Arts	13	81
Bachelor of Science	3	19
Total	16	100

Subsequently, 69% of administrators had received Master of Arts degrees with a small percentage of women possessing Master of Science degrees. Nineteen percent held degrees other than in Arts or Science. The Other category included degrees in Religion, Religious Education, and Education. See Table 6 below.

Table 6

Master's Degrees (N=16)

Master's Degree	N	%
Master of Arts	11	69
Master of Science	2	12
Religion	1	6.3
Religious Education	1	6.3
Education	1	6.3
Total	16	100

All sixteen women held earned Doctor of Philosophy degrees. See Table 7 below.

Table 7

Terminal Degrees (N=16)

Terminal Degrees	N	%
Doctor of Philosophy	16	100
Doctor of Education	0	0
Total	16	100

Administrators were asked to report their undergraduate and graduate majors. The categories for each included: humanities, hard sciences, social sciences, and other. The Other category included majors such as music, home economics, education, and clothing and textiles. The humanities were most represented by two degrees: 44% for undergraduate majors and 38% for Master's degree majors. Six administrators received their terminal degrees in the humanities, one received her degree in the social sciences,

and one in the hard sciences. The remaining administrators chose a field other than the categories listed above. Three administrators held Ph.D.'s in each of the following categories: systematic musicology, higher education administration, and clothing and textiles. Three administrators held Ph.D.'s in the field of curriculum and instruction and two in nursing. See Table 8 below.

Table 8

Major Fields of Study (N=16)

Major Field of Study	<u>Undergraduate</u>		<u>Master's</u>		<u>Doctoral</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Social Sciences	2	12	1	6	1	6
Humanities	7	44	6	38	6	38
Hard Sciences	1	6	2	12	1	6
Systematic Musicology	1	6	1	6	1	6
Curriculum and Instruction	0	0	0	0	3	19
Higher Education	0	0	0	0	1	6
Clothing and Textiles	0	0	0	0	1	6
Nursing	2	12	2	12	2	12
Home Economics	1	6	0	0	0	0
Education	2	12	3	19	0	0
Religion	0	0	1	12	0	0
Total	16	100	16	100	16	100

Marital Status.

At the time of the interviews, 13 administrators were married; one was divorced; and 2 had never married. None were widowed or separated. See Table 9 below.

Table 9

Marital Status of Women Administrators (N=16)

Marital Status	N	%
Married	13	82
Divorced	1	6
Never Married	2	12
Widowed	0	0
Separated	0	0
Total	16	100

Motherhood.

Of the 16 women administrators interviewed, 12 (75%) had children and 4 (25%) did not. One administrator had recently adopted an infant and another had adult stepchildren from her husband's previous marriage.

Husband's Vocation and Education.

Of the married administrators (N=13), one husband had some college credit, four husbands had a Bachelor's degree, four husbands had Master's degrees, three husbands had Doctor of Philosophy degrees, and one husband had a Law degree. See Table 10 below.

Table 10

Husband's Education (N=13)

Husband's Education	N	%
Some College	1	7.5
Bachelor's Degree	4	31
Master's Degree	4	31
Doctoral Degree	3	23
Law Degree	1	7.5
Total	13	100

Various vocational fields were represented by the 13 husbands of the married administrators. The most prevalent (N=6) field represented was education with the second field (N=3) labeled as Other. In the latter category, two were self-employed and one was a clinical social worker. See Table 11 below.

Table 11

Husband's Vocation (N=13)

Vocational Fields	N	%
Education	6	46
Corporate	2	15
Trade	1	8
Ministry	1	8
Other	3	23
Total	13	100

Adjectives.

As part of the Demographics section of the interview process, administrators were asked to identify adjectives they felt best described their personality and work style. Of

the myriad of adjectives that the women used to describe themselves, several patterns emerged. In addition to the terms used in Table 12 below, many women described themselves as determined, passionate, analytical, introverted, committed, efficient, joyful, and pragmatic. See Table 12 below.

Table 12

Adjectives Used to Describe Personality (N=frequency)

Adjectives	N
Hard-working	5
Caring	4
Energetic	4
Serious	3
Organized	3
Friendly	2
Outgoing	2
People-orientated	2

Though four administrators described themselves as out-going or people orientated, several had difficulty identifying themselves as either introverted or extroverted. For instance, one administrator responded to the question by saying, “I wouldn’t say that I’m excessively outgoing, but I’m not introverted exactly either. I’m somewhere in the middle. I don’t think there’s a word for me. It depends on the situation I’m in.” Another expressed similar sentiments: “I am not extremely extroverted, but I’m not extremely introverted either. In all those scales, I’d be somewhere in the middle.”

Family Influences

The second section of the interview process focused on the influence of parents, home life, and siblings during the administrator's adolescence. Early interests and aspirations were discussed, as well as identifying which parent provided the most encouragement for identified interests and aspirations. The following data report each administrator's family influences.

Mother's Educational Level.

Almost one-half (N=7) of the administrators' mothers held high school diplomas. Twelve percent went on to receive some college credit. Six women held advanced degrees. See Table 13 below.

Table 13

Mother's Educational Level (N=16)

Level	N	%
High School	7	43.75
Some College	3	18.75
Bachelor's Degree	4	25
Master's Degree	1	6.25
Doctoral Degree	0	0
Doctor of Medicine	1	6.25
Total	16	100

Father's Educational Level

Fathers of the administrators had more varied educational backgrounds than the mothers. Some had not finished high school and some held doctorates. One-half (N=8) of the administrators' fathers had some form of degree. Slightly less than one-half (N=7) had a high school education or less. See Table 14 below.

Table 14

Father's Educational Level (N=16)

Level	N	%
Eighth Grade	1	6.25
Tenth Grade	1	6.25
High School	5	31.25
Some College	1	6.25
Bachelor's Degree	2	12
Master's Degree	3	19
Doctoral Degree	3	19
Total	16	100

Further delineation between the educational levels of mothers and fathers reveals that almost half (N=7) of the administrators were first generation college students.

Place of Birth.

Each administrator's place of birth was identified and compared to their current employment location. The South and Northeast were the more prevalent geographical areas represented (N=6, N=5 respectively). Approximately one third of the administrators (N=5) now serve in areas of the country other than their birthplace. See Table 15 below.

Table 15

Place of Birth and Current Location (N=16)

Area	<u>Birthplace</u>		<u>Currently Serving</u>	
	N	%	N	%
West	1	6.25	4	25
South	6	38	7	44
Northeast	5	31.25	1	6
Midwest	2	12	4	25
Northwest	1	6.25	0	0
Foreign	1	6.25	0	0
Total	16	100	16	100

According to Table 15, almost one-third (N=5) of the administrators were quite mobile between their birth place and the geographical area in which they now serve.

Early Interests and Aspirations.

During adolescence, the interests and aspirations of the participating administrators ranged from teaching, medicine, the arts, science, and social activities. The two areas most represented were education (N=11) and medicine (N=3). Interests and aspirations were highly influenced by the roles other women performed in the administrator's life. For instance, one administrator admitted that she chose teaching early on because of her environment: "I kind of vacillated between being a teacher, being a nurse, and just being a mom. I was of that generation and within the religious persuasion that there wasn't a lot of options, not like we talk about today. Women, particularly women who married, probably were pretty much limited to teaching, or nursing, or maybe working in an office...or to simply be at home." Another expressed similar sentiments: "...both my grandmothers and my mother were minister's wives. My

dad was a pastor...so, I always sort of assumed that I would be a minister's wife...I assumed that I would probably be in a supportive role and not necessarily in a career that was the primary career."

One administrator aspired to teaching because she discovered a talent early in her elementary education. She explains: "I was always drawn to things academic. Always had a pretty good idea that that's what I'd be doing professionally. And I loved music, but I knew...I was good at English and knew that was probably what I'd be doing."

The next most represented interest (N=3) involved some sort of medical career. One administrator admitted that her "first clear goal...was medicine." The remaining interests and aspirations mentioned by the participants included: detective work for the FBI, cheerleading, dancing, singing, race car driving, horse back riding and competitions, music, and nursing. A few of the women had interest in activities that did not lead to specific fields. For instance, one administrator admitted that her early interest was friendships. "Friends, I would say, were my early interests. And aspirations included school involvement of all sorts – cheerleading, clubs – anything social."

Siblings.

The majority (N=15) of administrators came from families of more than two children. Only two of the administrators were firstborn. See Table 16 below.

Table 16

Siblings (N=16)

Siblings	N	%
Yes	15	94
No	1	6
Total	16	100

Childhood

This section of the Family Influences interview sought to describe each administrator’s childhood. Each administrator communicated several adjectives that described her early home life. The majority (N=13) reported that they had a happy childhood. Two reported having a difficult childhood.

One administrator described a happy childhood that was intellectually rigorous. She stated that “we would have discussions at the dinner table...my father is a very engaging and brilliant person. My sisters, my father, and I would have these conversations and he would invite us to refute him. He’d say ‘that’s illogical’ and we’d kind of just go back and forth. He held high standards for us, but he definitely projected that we would achieve, too.”

Another administrator shared that she had a somewhat limited childhood: “I grew up in a small town, close family. Life centered around church and school. I didn’t have wide-ranging educational experiences, as far as museums, theatres, or symphony orchestras. It was strictly home, church, and school.”

The remaining administrators described their childhoods as contented, happy, well-adjusted, loving, caring, and secure. See Table 17.

Table 17

Childhood (N=16)

Description of Childhood	N	%
Happy	13	82
Difficult	2	12
Limited	1	6
Total	16	100

Early Childhood Encouragement.

The last question posed to the administrators related to early childhood focused on the encouragement she received at home. Did her mother, father, or both encourage her aspirations? The administrators reported that their mothers (N=6) and a combination of their mothers and fathers (N=6) encouraged their aspirations the most.

Of her mother, one administrator stated that “[my mother] was very concerned that all of her children would receive a college education because she and my father did not. I knew at a very early age that my mother was putting \$5 a month away for each of her children to go to college.”

Of both her parents, one participant reported that they “were both very, very firm, very adamant about me. I just never even thought about the fact that I would not go to college and that I would not prepare myself to do something. That was kind of the ‘insurance package’ that I even remember before adolescence. I’d be going to college and get prepared to do something in case I had to support myself. It was, I think, equally voiced from both of [my parents].”

Though the majority received the most encouragement from their mothers or a combination of both parents, 25% reported receiving the most encouragement from their fathers. See Table 18 below.

Table 18

Early Childhood Encouragement (N=16)

Encouragement	N	%
Mother	6	37.5
Father	4	25
Both	6	37.5
Total	16	100

Social Influences – High School

In the third section of the interview, administrators were probed about their experiences and opinions while in high school - extra-curricular activities, academic challenges, early mentors, social status, and their opinion regarding the feminine role. These questions were included in an attempt to identify characteristics that would later form a pattern indicative of administrative careers.

Activities Outside the Home.

When asked how they spent their time outside the home, administrators gave varied responses. The most commonly represented activities were grouped into the following categories: sports, church involvement, the arts, academics, and leadership.

Though sporting activities were mentioned as extra-curricular activities, only 16% (N=3) reported participating. All three mentioned that, at the time they attended high

school, female sports were not highly developed within the school systems. One participated in sports leagues and another participated on “girls teams.” She mentioned that it was a “fun thing” because most female sports activities had not been taken seriously.

Church activities and participating in musical groups received equal representation (N=10 and N=10, respectively). One administrator reported that she “was very involved in church. I was a Sunday School teacher. I was a piano accompanist for church, and then I switched over to the organ. The church needed an organist so I kind of taught myself to play the organ.” Another reported participating in activities at church and, because her father was the pastor, was “there every time the door was open.” For one administrator growing up in the Midwest, her main activities revolved around her church simply because there was little else available.

Ten out of the 16 women reported participating in musical groups, either playing in the band, singing in the choir, or both. Four of the sixteen expressed involvement in academic honor clubs and six reported holding leadership positions in school, church, or youth related organizations. See Table 19 below.

Table 19

Activities Outside the Home (N=frequency)

Activities Outside the Home	N
Sports	3
Church	10
Arts	10
Academics	4
Leadership	6

Parental Expectations Academically.

As students, the administrators reported various expectations placed upon them by parents. Several mentioned that their parents expected them to excel (N=5), while others mentioned that little expectations were placed upon them (N=5). Of the latter, most commented that their parents did not need to encourage them to excel; they excelled because of self-motivation. One administrator described her motivation as “in-born – the kind of determination to like academic work and throw myself into it.” Another reported that her parents were not highly educated, even considered higher education suspect, but did expect her to do her best at whatever she did.

Slightly over one-third (N=6) stated that their parents expected them to do their best. One administrator reported that her parents “said that [I] had an obligation to do [my] best. If that’s a C, it’s a C; if it’s an A, it’s an A. But my parents didn’t make a big deal about grades.” Considering grades, another administrator reflected that her parents did not “hang grades over her head,” but gave a general sense that she should do well.

For those who reported that their parents expected them to excel, several commented that they were expected to “bring home A’s.” One reported that her parents

expected her to be valedictorian of her class. None in this category, however, expressed conflict or pressure from their parents regarding their performance in school. See Table 20 below.

Table 20

Parental Expectations Academically (N=16)

Expectations	N	%
Excel	5	31
Do her best	6	38
None	5	31
Total	16	100

Easy Subjects.

Administrators were asked in this section of the interview to identify those subjects in which they excelled easily in high school. The courses mentioned were grouped into three categories: Science-Math, Humanities, Arts, and All. Several (N=5) reported that they excelled in all subjects. Almost one half (N=7) reported excelling in the Humanities. See Table 21 below.

Table 21

Easy Subjects in High School (N=16)

Easy Subjects	N	%
Science-Math	2	12
Humanities	7	44
Arts	1	6
All	6	38
Total	16	100

Difficult Subjects.

Corresponding to subjects in which the administrators excelled are the subjects in which the administrators had difficulty. Only a few administrators felt that they had enough difficulty in any given subject to report it as such. Four of the sixteen women reported struggling with math, although one reported she still made A's. One administrator shared that English, Spanish, and History posed difficulty for her in high school. No other difficulties were noted. However, three noted not enjoying math though they did well in their math courses.

Early Mentors or Role Models.

This section explored the influence of individuals in the administrator's lives. Whether teachers, church leaders, parents, or friends, eleven of the sixteen interviewed identified one or more persons they felt served as a mentor or role model. Eight of the eleven with role models identified female role models and the remaining three identified male role models. Six of the mentors were high school teachers, one was a Girl Scout troop leader, another was the father of one of the administrators, one a pastor, one a catechism teacher, and one a private piano teacher.

Mentor's Role.

If an administrator acknowledged an early mentor or role model, she was asked to expand on the ways that mentor or role model influenced her life. The administrator who identified her piano teacher as a role model explained her influence as such: "I think it was just on a weekly basis of taking me out of my little, tiny world...my narrow world and my limited view...she would play records for me of the great symphonies and talk to me about opera. She enriched my education in ways that I didn't even notice at the time." One administrator shared that her mentors encouraged her to pursue a college education. "I think because of my circumstances, no one in my family had been to college and it didn't seem like a very logical thing for me to expect because of our financial situation, but they...sort of gave me that as a hope, a possibility."

Regarding her faith, another administrator reported that her pastor's life spurred her to greater understanding. She was particularly inspired by the way he modeled a life of faith and applied scripture to life situations. Another mentor helped one administrator realize that she could excel academically as well as socially. For yet another administrator, a youth group leader continually challenged her to develop her Christian faith. She realized it wasn't enough to be satisfied with the fact that she had grown up in a Christian home; her faith needed to be her own. For one administrator who dreamed of becoming a writer, a high school English teacher "quickly affirmed the strength and equally calling [her] to higher levels of performance in areas of weakness." She also reminisces about the influence of a fourth grade teacher who "was incredible with grammar, and in my sleep to this day, I can diagram sentences."

Social Status.

In this section of the interview, each administrator was asked about her social involvement during high school. Did she have a lot of friends or was she a loner? Half of the women interviewed reported having lots of friends. See Table 22 below.

Table 22

Social Status (N=16)

Social Status	N	%
Lots of Friends	8	50
2-3 Close Friends	7	44
Loner	1	6
Total	16	100

Feminine Role.

The final question in this section explored administrator's view of the feminine role during their high school years. Because the women interviewed for this study were serving in leadership roles, their views about women in leadership provided insight relative to their career path in Christian higher education. Several administrators gave lengthy responses. Others were surprised by its inclusion in the interview and found it difficult to answer conclusively. For instance, one administrator admitted to not thinking about the feminine role much. She further explains: "What did I think about the feminine role? I don't think I thought about it much. But I was not thinking I was limited to being a teacher or nurse. It was not limited thinking. I guess I thought I wanted to be a mother some day and have children." Another administrator reported being defiant about the expectations of others. She confided that there was a part of her that ignored the female

role. One administrator shared that she, too, did not think much about the feminine role: “I actually didn’t think about it too much. I never would have thought, for example, that you would be married or have a career. I never thought I’d run into that stereotype. I certainly didn’t have any sense of things that would be even remotely called feminist at that point.”

Two administrators expressed opinions that supported a male headship view. One defined her father as “being in charge.” She concluded that because of her parent’s relationship, she espoused a conservative view of the feminine role in which the husband was in charge of the home and any other arrangement meant that the wife was either radical or “into the gay movement.” Another administrator expressed a similar conservative viewpoint. She believed women should be educated in case they were forced to provide for themselves (through death of a spouse or never marrying). However, she inherited the belief that a woman should have as her highest calling to be a good wife. That often meant a somewhat subservient, but respectful, place in the relationship restricting the wife from taking any type of lead role.

Opposing the male headship view, two women expressed an egalitarian view of women’s roles. One administrator described it as such: “I honestly had no sense that there was any difference between women and men in terms of their opportunities. My high school teachers never hinted or suggested that [girls] couldn’t do it. It wasn’t until after college, when I started in the work force, that I found out women weren’t promoted as much as men.” Another administrator, because she was raised without a father, voiced the opinion that whatever needed to be done, women could and should do. As to her childhood, she recounts: “I didn’t have a father and my mother, as a single mother, fixed

the car and did repairs on appliances and laid a brick wall around the house...and because of that, I was never really socialized for a clear role distinction. My family was all-female and if something got done, we had to do it.”

Half of the administrators (N=8) viewed the feminine role as unlimited in opportunities. Many expressed that it never occurred to them that women should stay home or avoid careers. The administrators’ mothers often played a particular role in shaping their daughters’ view of femininity. For instance, one administrator recalled that her mother’s theology was quite simple – God gave gifts to women and expected them to be used. One administrator addressed women in leadership roles stating: “I’ve never been one to think that women should push their way in front of anybody else, but I believe if a woman has a strong personality and can lead, then she should be allowed to. But, I’ve never been opposed to women taking the back seat either if necessary. I don’t think every role has to be filled with a woman, but I don’t think that a woman should be denied that right if she’s got the personality and skills to do the job.”

The administrator’s responses were grouped into five categories. Because their opinions, at times, described multiple categories, percentage data are not relevant. The “No Opinion” category represents those administrators who were uninterested in analyzing the feminine role during their high school years. See Table 23 below.

Table 23

Opinions of the Feminine Role During High School (N=frequency)

Opinion	N
Male Headship	2
Egalitarian	2
Not limited	8
Limited	2
No opinion	7

Social Influences – College and Graduate School

The fourth section of the interview focused on each administrator’s experiences during college and graduate school. Specifically, why did each administrator chose to go to college? How did they choose their first institution? Did they have any challenges while in college? Subsequently, each was asked why they chose to continue their education in graduate school, if they had a mentor, and if they had any research interests that developed. The data are presented below.

Decision to Attend College.

When asked why they chose to attend college, the administrators’ responses fell into three categories: they were either expected to attend, wanted to attend, or encouraged to attend.

Of those who were expected to attend college (N=8), one administrator elaborated this way: “I think it was more or less expected. If you were bright and able then that’s a good thing...I remember lamenting the fact that my older sister, after she got married, quit working full-time. And to me that sounded like such a waste of a college degree. My father corrected me and said, ‘It’s never a waste. Even if you decide to be a full-time

parent, your education is still worthwhile. You don't just do it for a job. You do it to be educated. It's good to be educated.”

Another administrator described her decision as brainwashing: “There was never any decision about going to college. You just went to college. My sister, who was older than me, was just extremely smart, and just the talk of college was a given. I don't ever remember thinking that I wouldn't [attend].” For one participant, attending college was as natural and expected as attending high school.

Five of the 16 interviewed related that they attended college because they expected it of themselves and wanted to attend. For instance, one administrator confided that she had her heart set on not only attending college, but attending a specific institution. Furthermore, she began college at age 16 and felt that it was the “next step” in a series. Another administrator began college, left to work in industry, and returned later to complete her degree. “When I went back to college, it was because I wanted to become a writer, and I knew that I wanted to finish a college degree and open some doors.”

The last category included 2 administrators who were encouraged to attend college based on their abilities and gifts. Professional women played a vital role in both administrators' decisions to attend college. One reminisced about the influence of high school teachers and counselors: “Toward the end of my high school career, my high school counselors were strongly recognizing my academic abilities and encouraging me – ‘you must go to college, you've got lots of abilities.’ The teachers were sitting me down and saying, ‘you could teach math, you could be a science teacher, and would you consider majoring in this or this or this’...”

All but two (N=14) attended college directly from high school.

Choice of Undergraduate Institution.

This section of the interview process elicited reasons for each administrator's choice of undergraduate institution. Their responses ranged from acceptable geographic location, reputation of the institution, social factors, denominational ties of the institution, and financial aid received. If an administrator chose an institution because of its location (close to family or far from family), their responses was coded in the acceptable geographic category. If they chose their institution based on a friend's or sibling's choices, they were coded in the social influence category. See Table 24 below.

Table 24

Choice of Undergraduate Institution (N=16)

Choice of Undergraduate Institution	N	%
Acceptable Geographical Location	7	44
Institution's Reputation	5	31
Social Influence	2	13
Denominational Tie	1	6
Financial Aid Received	1	6
Total	16	100

Challenges.

In this section of the interview, each administrator identified academic challenges, if any, that they faced while in college. For instance, did a specific subject give them trouble? Was their personal faith shaken through opposing views? Nine administrators identified a specific challenge, the majority (N=5) being in their academic studies. Three

of the five expressed struggling in their science classes, especially chemistry. Another related that she had never experienced criticism regarding her writing abilities.

Three of the administrators expressed challenges regarding their personal faith. One administrator described it as such: “I came from a fairly conservative religious background and had never had any experience with the integration of faith and learning. When I went to the university...that was kind of a big challenge for me.” Another voiced the same sentiments: “Going to the university was, all of the sudden, being immersed in a whole new world of thinking and ideas.”

One administrator shared that the culture of her chosen institution produced the most challenge. Most of her peers came from wealthy families and thus, it was difficult for her to find common ground because she did not share the interests of her “materialistic” peers.

Though the majority (N=9) experienced some sort of challenge during their undergraduate career, none stated that said challenges radically changed their thinking or direction.

Easy and Hard Subjects.

Administrators were asked to share those subjects that gave them the most ease and those the most difficulty in college and graduate school. Subjects were grouped according to Science-Math, Humanities, and the Arts. Only twelve reported difficult subjects. See Table 25 below.

Table 25

Easy and Difficulty Subjects in College

	<u>Easy Subjects (N=16)</u>		<u>Difficult Subjects (N=12)</u>	
	N	%	N	%
Science-Math	4	25	10	83
Humanities	10	62	2	17
Arts	2	13	0	0
Total	16	100	12	100

Graduate School.

This section of the interview guide probed the reasons why each administrator chose to attend graduate school, how they chose their given institution, and how much time elapsed between each degree. The reasons each gave for attending graduate school were categorized into four areas: in order to pursue a vocation, for the love of learning, lack of direction after receiving bachelor’s degree, and financial opportunities. Several of the administrators had multiple reasons for attending graduate school, thus the data are presented in textual format as opposed to percentages.

Ten of the 16 administrators stated that they were pursuing a vocation as the reason for attending graduate school. Because one administrator chose the professoriate, she knew graduate school was required. Another desired to be the best in her field. One administrator, while working in campus ministry, discovered a love for teaching and decided to pursue graduate school in order to teach.

Yet another spent three unfulfilling years teaching high school before she pursued a graduate degree. “It was a difficult, difficult three years, but I knew I wanted to teach,

but I didn't feel like I was teaching. I felt like if I kept my students in their chairs for a full hour, I didn't have a fight, I didn't have somebody calling somebody's mother a bad name, I've had a good day. And that just went against every grain in my body. And so, I taught three years, got my car paid for, withdrew my retirement money, borrowed a little extra, got myself a part-time job at a barber shop, and went to graduate school."

Three of the 16 administrators gave reasons that fell into the category of a love for learning. After dropping out of her bachelor's program to begin a marriage and family, one administrator admitted to needing something more. She described going back to finish her bachelor's degree part-time while her daughter was very young. Her only goal at the time was to finish her undergraduate education. However, she had a professor who encouraged her to consider graduate school. She reminisces: "After a three and a half year time span, I grew into an academic world and really didn't want to stop learning. Finishing my bachelor's became no great milestone for me at all. I just wanted to continue, so I went to the university and started that summer. I had no break in between."

As a new Christian, one administrator chose graduate school to learn more about her new found faith. "I went to seminary first, because I had become a Christian and I wanted to get to know more about my faith, because I thought if that's true, it's the most important thing in life and I should understand it before I go any further in life." A few (N=2) confessed to choosing graduate school because they did not have a specific direction after receiving their bachelor's degrees. One administrator was encouraged to attend graduate school by her undergraduate mentor. "My advisor had given me a lot of encouragement about graduate school. I suppose that, in a sense, I went to graduate school the first go around because I really didn't have anything else I wanted to do, and I

got a fellowship, so it was the easy thing to do.” This administrator’s response fell into the financial opportunities category along with two other administrators. One administrator received a full tuition scholarship and another received an assistantship.

Choosing their graduate schools was similar to choosing their undergraduate institutions for many of the administrators. Seven of the 16 chose their institutions for geographical reasons. Four of these seven chose locations close to their spouses’ employment. One chose her institution because she was familiar with it and because her mentor remained on faculty. The remaining administrators (N=2) in this category chose their institution because it “was close by.” In addition to location, many (N=6) of the institutions chosen by the administrators had a good academic reputation. One administrator chose a seminary in the Midwest because she had been highly influenced by a group of Christians connected with the seminary. Another knew, by the time she applied for graduate school, what field she wanted to pursue and chose an institution with well-known people in that field and a rigorous academic program.

Each administrator was asked the number of years that elapsed between each degree they received. The majority took anywhere from one to five years between their bachelor’s and master’s degrees and their master’s and doctoral degrees (N=8, N=7, respectively). Several worked for a time period and one traveled as a part of her seminary training. Five administrators had no time off between any of their degrees. Twenty-four years elapsed between one administrator’s undergraduate and master’s degree and three took seven to 10 years before beginning their doctoral education. See Table 26 below.

Table 26

Number of Years between Degrees Received (N=16)

Number of Years	<u>Bachelors/Masters</u>		<u>Masters/Doctorate</u>	
	N	%	N	%
0 Years	9	56	7	44
1-5 Years	5	31	6	37
>5 Years	2	13	3	19
Total	16	100	16	100

Graduate School Mentors.

During graduate school, did the administrator have a mentor? If so, male or female? Seventy-five percent (N=12) acknowledged a mentoring relationship during graduate school. Of those twelve, six were female and five were male. One administrator expressed having mentoring relationships with both men and women. Four reported that they did not have a mentor during graduate school. See Table 27 below.

Table 27

Graduate School Mentors (N=16)

Mentors	N	%
Female	6	38
Male	5	31
Both	1	6
None	4	25
Total	16	100

Experiences of the administrators with their mentors ranged from personal to professional. A few remain close to their graduate school mentor today. One administrator described her relationship with her mentor as one of encouragement. He constantly reminded her that she “could do it.” As a first-generation college student, this type of encouragement was especially meaningful to her. One administrator shared that she would not have attended graduate school had it not been for her mentor. “I was really, I feel, a shy person, which may sound really odd because I was simultaneously very involved in activities, but I was just interpersonally pretty shy and did not have a great deal of confidence at that point. I think what she did was to really encourage me that I could do things.” Another mentor took an administrator “under her wing” and taught her the ropes of being a teacher.

Another approach of mentors, administrators reported, was that of challenging them to succeed. One administrator described how her mentor challenged her in the classroom: “To tell you the truth, I didn’t have a whole lot of confidence in my ability. So, I was nervous everyday going to class. He would test me. He would question me as he questioned other people, but I always felt like he was singling me out everyday –

‘What do you think about this article’ or ‘Could you explain this to me?’ And he admitted to me later...and he saw immediately that I could handle it. I could take him on. He then became a strong supporter of me, wanting to make sure that I stayed in the program, and he gave me lots of his time.”

Academic challenge seemed to be the primary means through which mentors influenced their protégées. Three administrators reported that their mentors had high expectations for them. “I was in a number of his classes. Lots of affirmation, personal interest. And lots of criticism if academic work wasn’t to his standards.” Another shared that she felt pushed by her mentor in positive ways. “I always felt that she believed in me. She was great when I was working on my doctorate because I could have her proof papers that I had written. And she could be very critical. And I, because of the relationship we had, could say: okay, self-esteem is strong this week – go at it. Or self-esteem is a little weak right now so be gentle.” Another administrator expressed similar sentiments regarding her mentors: “In some way, they critiqued or challenged me in my thoughts, behavior, or attitudes, but in a supportive way, so that I always felt their belief in me.”

One mentor influenced an administrator’s views of feminism as well as the administrator’s views related to her chosen field. “She was actually the one that challenged me with feminist criticism and theory. She had a moderate approach and didn’t force me to abase my faith as a radical feminist might have forced me.” This mentor also influenced the administrator personally: “Because I respected her so much as a teacher and so forth, later in my life I would think about how she would dress or conduct herself in particular meetings. She became a personal model, too.”

None of the administrators reported difficulty with mentors – either professionally or personally.

Research Interests.

This section of the interview process elicited whether or not the administrators had developed any research interests during graduate school. Ninety-four percent (N=15) reported developing some sort of academic interest. All of the administrators who responded to this question developed interests in their primary fields although some modified them slightly as they progressed through their doctoral work. As educators, five reported interests in cognitive development, literacy, learning styles, and effective teaching.

Two reported interests related to their faith. One explained the development of research interests as such: “I was very practice orientated. I thought I was there [in graduate school] for counseling, but I became very interested in Christian education and/or student development, so I was very practice orientated. In retrospect, I was really interested in the life of the mind from a spiritual standpoint.” Another administrator discovered her research interests while in seminary: “In seminary, I was a new Christian. There was a lot to learn and I loved learning and I loved talking to people about things that related to growing in my faith.”

Five of the administrators developed interests directly related to the humanities, specifically English or literature. A few (N=2) allowed their interests to include gender and women’s studies, as well as feminist theory.

The remaining administrators (N=4) developed highly specialized interests related to their fields. One administrator began studying European Intellectual History. Her

research explored the impact of the Enlightenment, specifically the history of religion, skepticism, faith, and doubt. Another administrator developed an interest through her dissertation research in textile conservation.

In conclusion, administrators' research interests were highly influenced by their chosen field of study.

Administrative Aspirations.

The last section of Social Influences – College and Graduate School discusses at what time each administrator aspired to administration. Surprisingly, the majority (N=11) of the administrators never aspired to administration. Of those who responded this way, it was usually adamant and emphatic. One admitted to “fighting it [administration] all along the way.” Another added: “At no point in my life have I ever [aspired to administration].” One even admitted to hating her first roles in administration: “I’m not sure I ever really wanted to do this. I taught without any administrative duties for seventeen years. I had always done things like chair committees. So, I’ve been involved in school-wide projects. Then I served as Associate Dean for one year and I really hated that.”

As to beginning an administrative career, one administrator reported that her position “kind of happened.” After serving in her administrative position, she reports: “I’m finding that I love administration and I know that I’m here for a reason. I feel that God has called me here. But I never did it. He did.”

Four of the women discovered during their early positions in higher education that they enjoyed administrative duties and reported that they aspired to administration once

employed in higher education. One administrator reported aspiring to administration during college. See Table 28 below.

Table 28

Administrative Aspirations (N=16)

Aspire to Administration?	N	%
Never	11	69
During College	1	6
During Higher Education Employment	4	25
Total	16	100

Vocational Influences

The fifth section of the interview collected data related to work experience in and immediately after graduate school, competencies that the administrators gained during this time, their career goal immediately after graduate school, their first administrative position in higher education, and their reflections of how they achieved their current position of chief academic officer.

Work Experience.

In this section of Vocational Influences, each administrator was asked what work experience they gained during and immediately after graduate school. Their responses were categorized into four areas: teaching, research, administration, and corporate (outside higher education). The majority (N=10) gained the most experience through teaching, either full-time, part-time, or as a teaching assistant. See Table 29 below.

Table 29

Work Experience In and After Graduate School (N=16)

Work Experience	N	%
Teaching	10	63
Research	2	12
Administration	1	6
Corporate	3	19
Total	16	100

Competencies.

In this section of the interview, each administrator was asked what competencies she developed during and immediately after graduate school. Did she develop teaching skills? Administrative skills? Responses were categorized into five areas: leadership, teaching, administrative, and technical. Several administrators gained experience in several categories. See Table 30 below.

Table 30

Competencies Gained During and After Graduate School (N=frequency)

Competencies	N
Leadership	8
Teaching	2
Administrative	9
Technical	1

Career Goal and Strategy.

After graduate school, did the administrator have a clearly defined career goal? Of the 16 interviewed, 50% stated teaching as their primary career goal. Three confessed to having no clear goal after completing their education and 5 had “other” goals. In the latter category, one administrator stated that her husband’s vocation limited her somewhat to certain fields. “I think I had intended to be a college instructor and do research. My husband is and was a minister and so that [option] wasn’t open to me, so that’s why I got into human resources and community research and involvement.” Another administrator’s response that fell in the “other” category described her career goal as the “freedom to follow the Lord.” One administrator’s career goal had nothing to do with higher education, she wanted to become a critical care clinical specialist in a hospital environment. See Table 31 below.

Table 31

Career Goal and Strategy (N=16)

Career Goal	N	%
Teaching	8	50
Administration	0	0
Other	5	31
None	3	19
Total	16	100

First Position in Higher Education Administration.

Having entered the field of higher education, what was each administrator's first position in administration? This question sheds light as to whether an obvious career path exists for female administrators in academic positions within Christian colleges and universities. Three categories were identified based on the administrators' responses: department chair, Vice President for Academic Affairs, and other. The department chair category includes, traditionally, only those individuals who had served as a full-time faculty member. Fifty percent of the administrators had administrative positions other than department chair. See Table 32 below.

Table 32

First Position in Higher Education Administration (N=16)

First Position	N	%
Department Chair	7	44
Vice President for Academic Affairs	1	6
Chair of the Self-study for Institutional Accreditation Chair	1	6
Coordinator of Service Learning	1	6
Dean of the School of Nursing	1	6
Assistant to the Provost	1	6
Program Director	1	6
Director of Teacher Education	1	6
Director of Special Programs	1	6
Director of the Michigan Higher Education Institute	1	6
Total	16	100

Current Position.

In this section of Vocational Influences, each administrator was asked to describe how they achieved their current position. Did she pursue it? Appointed? At the time of the interview, six administrators held the title of Vice President for Academic Affairs. One each held the following roles: Vice President and Dean of Academics, Vice President for Undergraduate Affairs and Academic Dean, Vice President and Dean of the Faculty, Academic Vice President and Dean. One administrator held the title Vice Provost for Curriculum and Faculty Development, another held the title Undergraduate Academic Dean, one served as Interim Provost, and two were Provosts.

Similar to the aforementioned data results of aspiring to administration, many (N=7) of the women believe they “fell into” their positions. One administrator described achieving her current position as being at “the right place at the right time doing God’s

work.” Another administrator does not view herself as an administrator: “I fell into [my position] kicking and screaming really...to be very honest, I still don’t think of myself as an administrator.”

The phraseology of this question in the interview guide often elicited responses describing the administrator’s job performance that led to her current position. At least three mentioned performing well in prior positions, attention to detail, and working well with others. The heart of the question was to determine whether each administrator was appointed to their current position or whether they pursued it. After further clarification, 69% (N=11) reported that they were appointed or invited to their current position by the President of their institution. The remaining five administrators pursued their position through application.

Adult Family Influences

Because many women face equally satisfying life role options, this section provided much insight as to how they manage their personal life role with their professional life role. If applicable, at what age did they marry and have children? How has marriage and motherhood affected their professional responsibilities? Have their husbands been successful in their professional endeavors? How have each managed their dual roles and any subsequent conflict?

Age of Marriage.

Of the sixteen administrators, 88% (N=14) had been married by the time of the interview. Their ages at the time of marriage fell into four categories: less than 20 years of age, 21-30 years of age, 31-40 years of age, and 41-50 years of age. See Table 33 below.

Table 33

Age at Time of Marriage (N=13)

Age of Marriage	N	%
Less than 20 Years	1	7
21-30 Years	10	72
31-40 Years	2	14
41-50 Years	1	7
Total	14	100

Age at Time of Childbearing.

This section of Adult Family Influences reports the age at which each administrator gave birth to or adopted children. Of the sixteen administrators, thirteen have children. Of the thirteen with children, two adopted children and one has stepchildren. The age range of 20-30 is the most representative (N=7) of when administrators had children. See Table 34 below.

Table 34

Age at Time of Childbearing or Adoption (N=12)

Age	N	%
20-30 Years of Age	7	64
31-40 Years of Age	5	36
Total	12	100

Effects of Marriage.

If the administrator was or had been married, how had her marriage affected her professional career? Had marriage provided a supportive avenue for her career to flourish or had it been a struggle? Of the fourteen administrators who fit in this category, 71% (N=10) described marriage affecting their careers positively. Seven of these ten women described their marriage or husbands as supportive.

One administrator described her marriage as a supportive part of her career. She credits her accomplishments to her husband's encouragement to finish her degree, attend graduate school, and choose where she wanted to work. Another administrator described her husband as her best ally and supporter. "He is as quiet and reserved as I am noisy and outgoing. He is not one who would ever want or receive the spotlight. He's been enormously supportive. I don't think I could have been a good mom and full-time...whatever I'm doing...if we hadn't had a magnificently cooperative relationship."

Several administrators (N=3) shared that their spouses performed nontraditional tasks so that they could pursue their vocation. For instance, one stated: "I can't imagine having gone this far without my husband's support emotionally, physically, and financially. He's the one at home right now with the baby, to give you an example." Another administrator shared that it was her husband's encouragement that led her to accept a Dean's position. "He really wanted it for me. And he agreed to attend all the things with me he had to attend and stay home when I had to go to meetings." One spouse of an administrator agreed to work part-time when his wife accepted her leadership position in higher education. She recalls: "My husband is a real partner and a friend, and I wouldn't be who I am without him. He's helped me grow personally and to

set high goals...and I know I'm really privileged to have a spouse that's willing to work half-time for example. I wouldn't be who I am without him."

Another administrator shared that her spouse was never threatened by her leadership opportunities. She described him as "having a pure heart and praying for [her] each step of the way." One administrator stated that her spouse delighted in her ministry and explained that her husband's support freed her to be what God wanted her to be.

Although the majority of the administrators' marriages were described as supportive, three described their marriages as less than beneficial for their careers. It was generally not because of an unsupportive spouse, but because of the tension produced between two equally satisfying roles (career and marriage) or the limitations marriage placed on professional progress. For instance, one administrator described it as hard, full of pressure, and a "tearing between two things that [I] could commit myself to."

Another admitted that her marriage placed mobility limitations on her career. "Well, it's [marriage] certainly limited where I can work...I did spend a year as a fellow with the U.S. Government which was an honorary appointment. Went back and forth between Washington D.C. and Washington state. I did post-docs and so on. My husband was extremely supportive of my doing that because of the limited options in the geographical area where we were placed." Another expressed similar mobility sentiments: "Had I not gotten married, I probably...who knows? I could have gone a totally different direction. I had an offer to teach at a school in Columbia that I might have taken. I certainly would not have gone to Colorado for my doctoral work had I not been married." One administrator had difficulty determining if marriage had affected her

career negatively or positively. She did admit that her marriage has forced her to be more organized and to balance things in her life.

Effects of Motherhood.

In this section of the interview, each administrator was asked how motherhood had affected their careers. The majority (N=7) with children describe motherhood as positively affecting their personal career. One described motherhood as somewhat negative and three described it as having no major influence.

Of those that described motherhood as positively affecting their career, many mentioned that having children helped them balance their personal and private lives. They were unable to work the same amount of hours because they held their families in high esteem, often before their careers, and made choices that reflected these convictions. One administrator specifically waited until her children were in college before she accepted a high-demanding administrative career. Another attended graduate school part-time while her children were young because “motherhood was very important to [her].”

Three described specifically how motherhood had helped their careers. One administrator believes she can more fully equip faculty with families because she has juggled similar responsibilities. Another described how motherhood had affected her service to parents on campus: “Being a mother helps me to know the sorrows and the disappointments and the pain and the joys people all around me experience, too. And particularly here in higher education, it really enables me to connect with parents. I know how they’re feeling when they send their kids to college.”

The only administrator who noted a negative aspect of motherhood on her career stated that it produces a tension between her roles. She explains: “There’s no doubt that motherhood is the number one, I wouldn’t say stressor, but it’s the leading factor in my professional life in terms of my schedule. Everything I do is more affected by motherhood than anything. So, it’s a strong influencer.”

Three admitted that motherhood has had virtually little effect on their careers. For one administrator, parenthood affects both the husband and wife in similar ways. She and her spouse viewed raising children as a joint effort and, because her husband was in full-time ministry, he often had more flexibility to meet their children’s needs. The second administrator stated that she had reached a place in her career that allowed greater flexibility by the time she had children. The last administrator in this category stated that she merely worked part-time as an instructor while her children were young so that she could manage her family and her career.

Husband’s Vocational Success.

Because each of the women in this study had reached an upper level of leadership and vocational success as demonstrated by their positions, those who were married were asked about their husband’s vocational success. Had their husbands also been successful? Or, had they deferred to their wives’ vocational interests? Of the thirteen currently married administrators, 69% (N=11) responded that their husbands had been successful. The remaining two administrators mentioned that their husbands had struggled or deferred to her career. One administrator blamed her mobility and “uprooting” her husband as a cause for his struggle. The other administrator confided that her husband had completely reshaped his career to suit her progress.

Of the nine who felt their husbands had been successful in their careers, one mentioned that her husband had made sacrifices and another mentioned that her husband had no desire to be “at the top of the pack,” which allowed her the freedom to pursue her career more fully.

Management of Personal and Professional Roles.

This section of the interview probed how each married administrator managed her family life. How did she juggle her professional responsibilities with the demands of her family? What roles did her husband fulfill in the family? Did she change her work habits when children arrived?

Of the thirteen married administrators, five specifically mentioned the word “juggling” when asked how they managed career and family. Another theme that emerged in their responses involved husbands assuming flexible, nontraditional roles. For instance, one administrator shared that she mowed the lawn as much as her husband, and he vacuumed the house as much as she did. Another stated that she and her husband considered themselves “equal partners from day one.” Both were able to arrange their work schedule so that they never relied on day care for their children. She admitted that with each phase of their lives, their lifestyle had to be re-structured to meet the changing demands. One administrator specifically stated that her marriage did not demand that either partner be role-specific: “We have changed jobs in the house and outside the house from time to time...right now, my husband is the lead cook in our family. He thinks about what we’re going to eat and fixes it. I come along and clean up and act as the chef’s helper.” About flexible roles, another administrator stated that she and her husband share a partnership, each performs according to his or her gifting. She shares:

“He[does] more of the laundry and the big major cleaning. I still do the bathrooms. But we made a deliberate decision as a couple that when I completed my doctorate that I would go back to work and be the quote-unquote breadwinner of the family. He would be the one that was available for the boys in the morning and the afternoons, for field trips, and be involved in PTA and PTO.”

Because one administrator married young, she and her husband were able to carefully plan for their careers and family. Similar to what the above administrator stated, she and her husband made conscious decisions about managing their roles. She explains: “Because we married young, we had the advantage that we could plan our careers to be compatible. Because I was not marketable as a Ph.D. in English, we wanted to make sure he was very marketable. And he is. He could get a job in any city...he had the background in family therapy and child development, so it made sense for him to spend more time on the home front.”

Two administrators shared that they integrated their work life with their family life. For instance, one administrator shared that her daughter had “grown up on campus.” Because the family lived very close to the campus, her daughter never thought of work and home as separate. She explains further: “She [her daughter] knows the whole faculty and she knows all the students...when I come back [to campus] at night for concerts or games or whatever, she comes with me. So, it’s not like I’m going away from her again. And she’s been involved in a lot of things. My husband and I have taken student groups to England, South America, South Africa, and she always goes with us.”

Another administrator who mentioned integrating her family and work lives stated that she utilized students to provide in-house childcare for her children. She also realized

that her home life needed to be stable for her to perform her job well: “To me, if things aren’t going well at home, things cannot go well here [at work] either. And so, that’s first.”

An administrator who married later in life shared that she deliberately modified her work responsibilities to accommodate the needs of her marriage. For instance, her husband requested that she not take long trips related to work. She confided that it was not a difficult decision: “You know, I’ve been overseas eight times. I think I can give that up...I’ve had to curtail things like that, but that’s okay. I’ve gained other things.”

Another administrator, when asked how she managed work and family, replied: “Sometimes it seems like you can’t do it.”

This question revealed that administrators with marriages and families have had to be organized, multi-taskers, and accept nontraditional roles for themselves and their husbands in order to succeed at both responsibilities.

Conflict in Personal and Professional Life.

Similar to the interview question above, this section explored what, if any, conflict arose as each administrator juggled work and family. Of the nine who responded to this question, four admitted that their number one conflict was scheduling – scheduling enough family time, schedule demands at work, and having to choose between events and responsibilities. Another shared that she wonders about the effect her working had on her children: “I suppose one always wonders whether your children got the full measure of support that they were looking for when you were busy working...I would think the issue of having sufficient tension or support to your children in a sense of did they feel like

they were supported, did they have a mom, did they have a dad, was always in one's mind.”

Although she experienced conflict in her roles, one administrator shared that it was not a “horrible, miserable struggle...just a daily consciousness of it, that [my] kids need me and [my] work needs me and how do [I] make enough to go around?” One administrator stated plainly that finding enough family time was always a struggle. She places family time first and personal time second and admitted that it is often personal time that gets sacrificed more than anything else.

The majority of the married administrators (N=9) confessed to some sort of conflict in managing their careers and families, but not one said the outcome (having a career and a family) was unworthy of the effort.

Critical Incidences

In this section of the interview, each administrator was asked what experiences they felt particularly meaningful or strategic in helping her reach her current position and if she would change anything about her career path.

Critical Incidences.

As to be expected, responses were highly varied and personal. However, several patterns emerged. Experiences were categorized into the following areas: spiritual encounter, experience outside higher education, encouragement from institution's president, influence of previous mentors, sense of calling, chairing a department, success with accrediting organizations, and involvement with the CCCU Leadership Institute.

Spiritual encounters included those experiences when the administrator sensed a direct calling from God and felt compelled to be obedient to that calling. For those who stated experience outside higher education as a critical incidence, one was involved with research and another in community service. Several administrators gave responses that did not fit into the stated categories. For instance, one mentioned that having her dissertation published was highly influential in her career path. Another shared that her extended family's experience with Christian ministry and Christian higher education proved highly influential in her adult vocational choices. In the face of criticism, one administrator shared that standing up for what she believed resulted in affirmation from her institution's president. Still another mentioned leaving lucrative careers so that she and her husband could focus on their marriage. One administrator stated that the early death of her mother and the family's constant mobility forced her to be independent at an early age and thus, contributed to where she is today. For the remaining categories, see Table 35 below.

Table 35

Critical Incidences Affecting Career Paths (N=frequency)

Critical Incidences	N
Spiritual Encounters	3
Experience Outside Higher Education	2
Encouragement from Institution's President	2
Influence of Previous Mentors	3
Sense of Calling	2
Chairing an Academic Department	3
Success with Accrediting Organizations	3
Involvement with the CCCU Leadership Institute	2

Career Path Changes.

In this section, each administrator was asked what she would change about her career path if anything. Would she have chosen a different field? Taught more or less? Been more involved with research? Responses were highly varied and personal. One pattern emerged in the responses. Sixty-three percent of the administrators (N=10) stated that they would not change anything about their career paths.

Of the remaining, three stated that they wish they had chosen a different field of study and two wished they had taken their undergraduate studies more seriously. Other items that administrators stated they would change about their career paths include: more commitment to discipline, more publications, starting a family during graduate school, obtaining experience at multiple Christian higher education institutions, and obtaining her Ph.D. earlier in life.

Overall, the majority (N=10) responded that they would not change anything about their career paths.

Role of Faith

This last section of the interview explored the role that faith played in each administrator's career path. How did she experience her faith as an administrator in a Christian institution? Did she rely on her faith for decision making? If so, in what way? To conclude this section, the administrators were asked what advice they would give for women aspiring to administration in Christian colleges and universities.

Role of Faith.

Several of the administrators believe their faith in God translates into their calling to Christian higher education. Four specifically stated that their positions in

administration were unique callings from God. One explained it as such: “On the one hand, I guess I’d say that I felt sort of a sense of calling to work in Christian colleges, because I believe so much in Christ-centered education.”

Four administrators described how they spent time with God on a daily basis – through prayer and devotion. One described her faith practice as a dependency: “I don’t know how people function without faith. I have a strong faith. I always have since I was raised in a family with a Baptist preacher for a daddy. I depend on my faith. I believe in prayer. I never try to do anything without praying about it first.” Another administrator stated her reliance on faith in this way: “I begin everyday in a special prayer chair that I have in a breakfast nook - a time of reflection, usually with prayer. And in the evening, I have found tremendous meaning and direction by mentally formulating the questions to which I have no answers, and I find that the creativity of the God of the universe is very accessible to us when we lay the problem out, but don’t try to force the answer. Many, many, many times in the morning the answer has come, the thought is there...I do believe the Spirit of God dwells in us.”

Six of the administrators believe their positions are a part of God’s plan for their lives. As a result, they look to Him through godly counsel and prayer for direction regarding the work environment. One administrator admitted that early in her academic studies, she gave little credit to her faith. However, as her career progressed, she began to see God’s intervention in her life through her career path development. She states: “When you look back and see how things went, you just know that...Christ was walking right beside you and you know that there was a plan. I didn’t do a single thing. All I did was put all my energy into God’s plan. It was God’s plan all along.” Another stated her

view of faith as being committed to God for His use and purposes. When asked what role faith has played in her career path, another administrator explained it as such: “I think it’s played a huge role. You know, the whole destiny thing – the way I ended up here without ever applying to be here...I’m not just doing a job, but kind of fulfilling a commission.”

Advice to Women.

The very last question of the interview asked the administrators what advice they would give to a woman aspiring to Christian higher education administration. The responses were categorized into the following nine areas: networking, prayer and obedience, receiving a good education, taking risks, having varied experiences, performing small tasks well, having mentors, thinking gender-less, and other. In the last category, one administrator advised women to develop thick skins. Another suggested waiting until one’s 40’s before marrying. One administrator advised women to obtain experience as a faculty member before entering administration. As to direction, one administrator stated: “Listen to the Lord...the Lord has a plan for our lives, truly, that is unique to us. And so, the number one thing is to listen to what the Lord is asking you to do, what the Lord is directing you to do, because it may be fairly standard, it may be fairly traditional, or it may go against the grain of everybody that talks to you.”

For the remaining categories’ response frequencies, see Table 36 below.

Table 36

Advice to Women Aspiring to Administration (N=Frequency)

Advice to Women	N
Networking	4
Prayer and Obedience	3
Receiving a Good Education	2
Taking Risks	4
Having Varied Experiences	6
Performing Small Tasks Well	4
Having Mentors	4
Thinking Gender-less	4
Other	4

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to explore and describe the career paths of women administrators holding the title of Vice President of Academic Affairs, or its equivalent, in member institutions of the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities (CCCU). In describing the typical career path, eight categories were used to distinguish contributing factors. These categories included demographics; family influences; social influences in high school; college and graduate school; vocational influences; adult family influences; critical incidences; and faith influences. In-depth, personal interviews were used to gather data from each participating administrator. Several patterns emerged relative to the data collected and are discussed in the following summary.

Summary

The findings are organized according to the research questions that guided the study:

1. What demographics characterize women administrators serving in the CCCU?

The first four sections of the interview dealt specifically with demographics that characterized each administrator. The majority of the participants had been at their current institution for more than five years and in their current position for less than five. Incidentally, four had been in their positions for less than one year. Age-wise, an equal number of administrators were in their 40's as were in their 50's. The administrators held the Ph.D. degree exclusively, with the majority majoring in nontraditional fields.

However, for undergraduate and master's degrees, the majority of administrators received their degrees in the arts, with the humanities most represented by the two degrees.

A majority of the administrators were married and had one or more children. Most had married and had children in their 20's. Of the married administrators, most had husbands with graduate degrees with education as the most prominent field of study. The other fields represented by administrators' husbands included: ministry, social work, corporate, and self-employment.

Administrators used a wide variety of adjectives to describe themselves. One-fourth described themselves as hard-working, the most represented adjective. Energetic, caring, serious, organized, friendly, outgoing, and people-orientated were adjectives also used frequently by the administrators.

As children, administrators were raised by parents with a variety of educational backgrounds. Almost half of the administrators' mothers received high school diplomas with the remaining receiving anywhere from some college credit to advanced degrees. Administrators' fathers were even more varied in their educational backgrounds. Several did not finish high school while six received advanced degrees. As a result, almost half of the administrators interviewed were first generation college students. Only one administrator was an only child, with the remaining having one or more siblings. Eighty-two percent of the administrators interviewed described their childhood as happy.

Although CCCU institutions are dispersed throughout the United States, the largest number of administrators interviewed were serving at institutions in the south. The northeast was the second most represented region. Ironically, almost half of the administrators were raised in the south.

As children, the administrators reported a wide range of aspirations and interests. Education and medicine were the most represented interests by the administrators, although many expressed interests in musical activities, cheerleading, friends, horse back riding, detective work, race car driving, dancing, and nursing.

Some of these interests followed the administrators into their high school years. Roughly 63% continued their interest in musical activities by participating in the high school band and/or choir. Another 63% expressed being involved with their church youth group. Other activities included school sports and involvement in organizations in which the administrator held a leadership position. Exactly half of the administrators expressed having lots of friends during high school, with the remaining majority identifying 2-3 close friends.

Regarding their view of the feminine role while in high school, the majority expressed an egalitarian view of male and female roles. None identified themselves as feminist, but they also believed they had equal opportunities. Almost half of the women admitted to having no conclusive opinion regarding male and female roles. Four expressed that, during their adolescent years, they believed men should be “in charge.”

Academically, the administrators excelled. The majority expressed more confidence in the humanities than the hard sciences or mathematics, although a close majority expressed having no trouble in any subject. Parental expectations ranged from expecting her to “do her best” and expecting her to excel. Surprisingly, five administrators responded that they felt no academic expectation from their parents.

All the administrators interviewed completed terminal degrees with the majority taking no breaks between degrees. Initially, the administrators chose their first institution

based on its geographical location or its reputation. In choosing to go to graduate school, the majority responded that they chose to pursue graduate education because they were pursuing a vocation. Again, they chose their graduate institutions for geographical reasons: either it was close to their husband's employment or close to their current employment.

The administrators reported that they developed specific research interests while in graduate school. The majority pursued research related to their field with the most represented fields being education and the humanities. Several pursued research interests related to their faith.

2. What was the first administrative position and latter career path in higher education of CCCU women administrators?

Although many of the administrators aspired to teaching in higher education, an overwhelming majority replied that they had never aspired to administration. Only four reported an interest in administration during their early faculty years and one during graduate school. Ninety-four percent of the administrators reported that they achieved their current position while working in other higher education positions. Almost fifty percent considered serving as department chair their first administrative position. Exactly fifty percent fulfilled specific administrative roles other than department chair. These positions included dean, program director, and coordinator positions, among others. Only one administrator entered higher education as Vice President for Academic Affairs. This individual had served almost 20 years in a higher education organization, other than academia. Those who served as department chair began their careers as faculty members. After serving as department chair, several administrators served as deans before assuming

their academic affairs post. Many of the administrators who served in specific administrative roles also served as faculty. Once they entered administration, none returned to full-time teaching. In summary, the typical administrator followed one of two career paths upon completion of her terminal degree: 1) faculty ranking to department chair to academic administration, or 2) administrative positions other than academic affairs followed by academic administration.

The fact that many of the administrators did not aspire to administration correlates with the fact that 50% of the administrators stated teaching as their career goal after graduate school. The remaining stated that they had other career goals or that they did not have a specific career goal at all.

3. What encouragement or discouragement from friends, family, and mentors did each CCCU administrator experience?

As children, the administrators reported that they either received the most encouragement from their mothers or a combination of their mother and father regarding their aspirations and interests. One administrator received discouragement from a family member who expressed concern over the administrator's lack of marriage at the time of her doctoral studies. During high school, the majority of the administrators identified one or more individuals as mentors or serving as role models. The mentor's role was generally to encourage the future administrator in her academic endeavors. Many believed their mentors instilled confidence in them. A few stated that their mentor challenged them spiritually. Regardless of the emphasis, each administrator shared that they felt championed by their mentor.

During graduate school, the majority experienced the impact of a mentor. In this stage of their lives, the administrators overwhelmingly reported that the greatest impact dealt with developing their professional abilities. An equal number of administrators had either a male or female mentor. No one reported having any difficulty with her mentor, whether professionally or personally. Many stated that their mentors continue to be a part of their lives today.

The married administrators overwhelmingly reported that their spouses have played a key role in their vocational success, offering encouragement, family support, and the opportunity for mobility.

4. What critical incidences brought the administrator to her current position?

Critical incidences were defined in this study as those experiences the administrator believed to be highly influential in achieving her current position. One might expect the range of experiences to be highly varied among the administrators. However, several consistent patterns emerged. Several administrators reported specific spiritual experiences that they believe led them to their current position. Several described a critical incidence as a “sense of calling.” An equal number reported that the influence of mentors, chairing an academic department, and success with accrediting organizations were especially important in their career path. Having a good relationship with and receiving encouragement from the institution’s president proved critical in two of the administrator’s career paths. In addition, two reported that their experiences outside higher education, in research and corporate work, were important.

Of particular interest to this study is the impact the CCCU Leadership Institute had on several of the administrators. Although only two identified their involvement

with the Institute as critical, four mentioned the Institute's positive impact at other times during the interview. Only six administrators reported being involved in the Institutes.

5. Does the administrator acknowledge her Christian faith as playing a role in her career achievement?

An overwhelming majority reported that their faith played a key role in their career development.

6. In what ways does the administrator acknowledge the role her faith has played?

Though highly personal, administrators' identified several faith influences that contributed to her career development. Four reported that they believe their positions were unique callings from God. Another four described how they spent time in prayer and devotion on a daily basis, seeking solutions to vocational dilemmas. Six administrators stated that they believe their positions in higher education administration were "part of God's plan" for their lives. In this sense, obedience to God became a key factor. These administrators believed they were called to a specific task and that God equipped them to complete it.

Discussion of the Findings

In an effort to identify and describe career paths of women administrators in a qualitative manner, with many subjective questions, one might find emergent patterns difficult to identify. However, many patterns did emerge. For instance, the women interviewed in this study received terminal degrees largely in an academic discipline (e.g., history, English) or a specified field of education (e.g., Curriculum and Instruction). Secondly, the majority entered their academic administrative position through the faculty

ranks. Both patterns are consistent with established higher education career paths in academic affairs found in the literature.

A second pattern that emerged was that the majority of administrators were married and had children. As part of an evangelical community, it is often assumed that married women would devote time and energy to children and home life. However, no administrator reported taking an extended leave of absence once she entered her higher education vocation in order to have and raise children. This pattern is consistent with women administrators of secular institutions as identified in the literature. In juggling their careers and families, many of the administrators reported attending school on a part-time basis, teaching fewer classes, or designing her work schedule in order to accommodate her family responsibilities.

Due to the unique controversy of women in leadership in evangelical institutions, whether church or parachurch, one might expect little female involvement as Vice President or above. This assumption was supported by the small number (18) of women serving as academic officers at the over 90-member CCCU. This small percentage might be attributed to the lack of encouragement women receive to pursue such positions. Or, it might be attributed to the fact that many Christian women spend a great portion of their adult lives raising children and are unable to maneuver the necessary academic ladder for a top-level academic position. A further explanation might include the fact that many evangelical organizations simply do not allow women in leadership roles. If there exists a standard career path for academic leadership - terminal degree, faculty status, tenure, publications, chair of a department, dean - many capable Christian women may not be able to juggle the responsibilities of a highly demanding academic career and equally

demanding home life. However, half the administrators in this study conformed to this standard career path while the remaining forged an alternative career path.

The administrators in this study reported only positive relationships and outcomes with their mentors, whether male or female. Although this is a pattern for this study, it does not necessarily correlate with the literature on the subject. Sexual harassment, lack of female role models, and the “queen bee syndrome” often inhibit women from receiving adequate mentoring. It is possible that the women in this study, by the standards of conduct dictated by evangelical Christianity, were spared inappropriate or awkward mentoring relationships.

An unusual pattern emerged among the married administrators in that the majority reported being married to a spouse who had achieved success in his field. One might expect, especially in evangelical marriages, that the husband pursues a vocation and functions as the sole breadwinner, often requiring the devotion and support of a spouse at home. However, another viewpoint within the evangelical tradition purports that the husband’s leadership is not evidenced in his particular behavior (i.e., sole breadwinner) but in his ability to lead his family so that each member reaches his or her potential, self-sacrificing as a servant leader for the family. The spouses of administrators in this study functioned in this latter viewpoint. They were not only successful in their careers, but also often functioned in nontraditional roles in order to support their wives and children. Many changed geographic locations and careers so that their wives could pursue academic vocations.

An assumption in elementary and secondary education that is often realized in undergraduate and graduate education is that boys and men excel in math and science,

while girls and women excel in the humanities and the arts. This assumption was supported in this study to a certain degree. Most of the women felt most comfortable in their English, literature, and language classes with a few struggling in math and science. However, those that reported some difficulty in the latter responded that they simply had to work a little harder to maintain their A's.

The standards of membership in the CCCU require a commitment to integrate faith and learning. It is expected that Christian faith would play a role in the career paths of administrators serving in the CCCU. The experiences of the women in this study support this expectation in very tangible ways. They do not take their positions as academic officers lightly. It is, for the majority, a calling from God in which they expend a great deal of time and energy, both in their academic responsibilities on a day-to-day basis, as well as praying for and with faculty and sharing in the lives of those around them.

Conclusions

The following tentative conclusions can be drawn based on the findings from this study:

1. Few women hold CAO positions in CCCU institutions.
2. Female CAO's serving in CCCU institutions achieve their positions as academic officers in addition to marriage and motherhood.
3. Longevity in their academic position is not characteristic of women CAO's in CCCU institutions.
4. Parental support regarding education is important for aspiring women administrators, yet they are likely to be first generation college students.

5. Women administrators seek terminal degrees in the humanities or education prior to their appointments in higher education.
6. The majority achieve their CAO positions after a traditional academic career progression of faculty member and department chair.
7. Women administrators benefit positively from the influence of a mentor or role model, both in high school and later in college and graduate school. Mentors serve primarily as encouragers and challengers in the administrator's academic endeavors.
8. Women administrators in CCCU institutions believe that giftedness, ability, and calling supercede certain evangelical stereotypes as the basis for achieving high level administrative positions.
9. Because they believe that their positions are unique callings from God, women administrators do not aspire to administration.
10. Hard work, attention to detail, and the willingness to assume added responsibilities are key characteristics that prime a woman for leadership roles in academic administration.
11. Faith is highly influential in the career decisions of women administrators serving in CAO positions in the CCCU.

Recommendations for Future Research

1. A study should be conducted identifying and describing the career paths of women administrators at institutions, both secular and religious, outside the CCCU to determine if similar or different patterns exist between the two.

2. A comparison study should be conducted that identifies and describes the career paths of male CAOs serving in member institutions of the CCCU and compares the findings to the career paths of female CAOs serving in the CCCU.

3. Further investigation should be pursued analyzing the impact of marriage and family on women administrators serving in the CCCU.

4. A study should be undertaken to identify and describe if gender bias affects promotion and leadership success among women administrators serving in the CCCU.

5. Follow-up studies should be conducted with the women in this study to determine if longevity in their CAO position increases.

6. Replicate studies with the American Theological Schools and American Association of Bible Schools should be conducted to compare women's opportunities, experiences, and roles with the findings of this study.

APPENDIX A
MEMBER INSTITUTIONS OF THE
COUNCIL FOR CHRISTIAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Member Institutions
Council for Christian Colleges and Universities

Abilene Christian University
Anderson University
Asbury College
Azusa Pacific University
Bartlesville Wesleyan College
Belhaven College
Bethel College (Indiana)
Bethel College (Kansas)
Bethel College (Minnesota)
Biola University
Bluffton College
Bryan College
California Baptist University
Calvin College
Campbellsville University
Campbell University
Cedarville College
College of the Ozarks
Colorado Christian University
Cornerstone College
Covenant College
Dallas Baptist University
Dordt College
Eastern College
Eastern Mennonite University
Eastern Nazarene College
East Texas Baptist University
Erskine College
Evangel University
Fresno Pacific University
Geneva College
George Fox University
Gordon College
Goshen College
Grace College
Grand Canyon University
Greenville College
Hope International University
Houghton College
Huntington College
Indiana Wesleyan University
John Brown University

Judson College
King College
The King's University College
Lee University
LeTourneau University
Malone College
The Master's College and Seminary
Messiah College
MidAmerica Nazarene University
Milligan College
Montreat College
Mount Vernon Nazarene College
North Park University
Northwest Christian College
Northwest College
Northwestern College (Iowa)
Northwestern College (Minnesota)
Northwest Nazarene College
Nyack College
Oklahoma Baptist University
Oklahoma Christian University of Science and Arts
Olivet Nazarene University
Oral Roberts University
Palm Beach Atlantic College
Point Loma Nazarene University
Redeemer College
Roberts Wesleyan College
Seattle Pacific University
Simpson College and Graduate School
Southern Nazarene University
Southern Wesleyan University
Southern Baptist University
Spring Arbor College
Sterling College
Tabor College
Taylor University
Trevecca Nazarene University
Trinity Christian College
Trinity International University
Trinity Western University
Union University
University of Sioux Falls
Vanguard University of Southern California (formerly Southern California College)
Warner Pacific College
Warner Southern College
Western Baptist College

Westmont College
Wheaton College
Whitworth College
Williams Baptist College
William Tyndale College

APPENDIX B
INVITATION LETTER

Name
Title
Address

Dear Dr. ,

As one of 18 female chief academic officers in the Council for Christian Colleges and Universities, you represent one who has achieved an unusual position in Christian higher education.

It is because of your achievement that we are inviting you to participate in dissertation research through the Program in Higher Education at the University of North Texas. Findings from this study should provide more specific understanding of the development of female administrators in colleges and universities, and especially for women in Christian colleges and universities. Your experience and insight will be invaluable to other women in the field as well as contribute to an area previously unexplored in the literature.

Your participation signifies your consent to be a part of this study; you will incur no repercussion if you choose to withdraw from the study. There are no known risks to you as all information will be coded for confidentiality and accessible only to the primary researcher. In reporting the data, your identity and institution will not be published.

We know that the professional demands placed upon you are great. Therefore, we are asking that you give only 1 to 2 hours of your time for an in-depth, personal, phone interview scheduled at the most convenient time for you. To best represent you, we would like to tape record the interview.

Won't you thoughtfully consider joining us in this venture? We will contact you in two weeks to confirm your participation, answer any questions, and schedule an interview time. Lastly, we respectfully ask that you forward a vita or resume to validate your career path. A self-addressed stamped envelope is included for your convenience.

Sincerely,

April L. Moreton
Research Analyst, Dallas Baptist University, 214-333-5275

Ron Newsom, Ph.D.
Coordinator, Program in Higher Education, University of North Texas, 940-565-2722
This project has been reviewed and approved by the UNT Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects (940-565-3940).

APPENDIX C
INTERVIEW GUIDELINE

Interview Guideline
Open-ended Questionnaire

Demographics

1. Name:
2. Title:
3. Name of current institution:
4. Years in current institution:
5. Years in current position:
6. Age: 30-40_____40-50_____50-60_____60-70_____70+
7. What degrees do you hold and from where did you receive them?
8. Undergraduate major:
9. Graduate major (s):
10. Marital Status: single_____married_____divorced_____widowed_____
11. Number of children:
12. Husband's vocation:
13. Husband's education: high school_____bachelors_____masters_____doctorate
14. What adjectives would you use to describe yourself?

Family Influences

15. Mother's education: high school_____bachelors_____masters_____doctorate
16. Father's education: high school_____bachelors_____masters_____doctorate
17. What is your place of birth?
18. Where did you grow up?
19. What were your early interests and aspirations?
20. Did you have siblings? If so, were they older and/or younger than you?
21. How would you describe your childhood?
22. Who encouraged your aspirations the most – your mother or father?

Social Influences – High School

23. What were your activities outside the home?
24. What were your parent's expectations of you academically?
25. In what subjects did you excel?
26. Did you have any early mentors or role models?
27. Specifically, how did he/she/they encourage and challenge you?
28. Were you a loner or did you have a lot of friends?
29. What were your feelings about the feminine role?

Social Influences – College and Graduate School

30. Why did you decide to go to college?
31. How did you choose your first institution?
32. What, if any, were your intellectual challenges?

33. In what subjects did you excel?
34. What subjects gave you the most difficulty?
35. Why did you decide to go to graduate school?
36. How much time elapsed between your bachelor's, master's, and doctoral degrees?
37. How did you choose your graduate school?
38. Did you have mentors or role models during graduate school?
39. If so, how did he/she/they influence you?
40. While in graduate school, what specific research interests developed?
41. At what point did you aspire to be an administrator?

Vocational Influences

42. What work experience did you gain during and immediately after graduate school?
43. What specific competency did you develop?
44. What was your career goal and strategy after graduate school?
45. What was your first position in higher education administration?
46. How did you achieve your current position?
47. Did you pursue your current position or "fall into it"?

Adult Family Influences

48. If applicable, at what age did you get married? Have children?
49. If applicable, how has marriage affected your professional career?
50. If applicable, how has motherhood affected your professional career?
51. If applicable, has your husband been successful in his professional endeavors?
52. How have you managed family and professional career roles?
53. Have you experienced any conflict between family and professional career?
54. If so, describe.

Critical Incidences

55. Please identify three experiential factors that have been especially important in helping you reach your current position.
56. If you could change anything about your career path, what would it be? Why?

Faith Influences

57. What role has faith played in your career decision-making?
58. What advice would you have for a woman aspiring to Christian higher education administration?

REFERENCES

Allen, L. H. (1984). On being a Vice President for Academic Affairs. Journal of NAWDAC, 47 (4), 8-15.

American Council on Education (2000). Facts in brief: Women more likely than men to attend and complete college, NCES study shows. Available: http://www.acenet.edu/hena/facts_in_brief/2000/00_05_15_fib.html [2000, June 6].

American Council on Education (2000). More women serve as college presidents, ACE survey shows. Available: http://www.acenet.edu/hena/issues/2000/09_11_00/women.html [2000, September 11].

Barrax, J.D. (1985). A comparative career profile of female and male university administrators. Journal of NAWDAC, 48 (2), 26-31.

Bird, G.W. (1984). Family and career characteristics of women and men college and university administrators. Journal of NAWDAC, 47 (4), 21-28.

Bower, F.L. (1993). Women and mentoring in higher education administration. In Mitchell, P.T. (Ed.), Cracking the Wall (89-98). Washington: The College and University Personnel Association.

Brown, G. & Burt, E. (1990). What motivates women to pursue administrative positions? Delta Kappa Gamma Bulletin, 56 (2), 45-52.

Cejda, B.D., Bush, W.B., Jr. & K. L. Rewey. (In Press). Profiling the chief Academic officers of Christian colleges and universities: A comparative study. Christian Higher Education: A Journal of Applied Research and Practice.

Creswell, J.W. (1994). Research Design: Qualitative & Quantitative Approaches. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Cullivan, K.G. (1990). Women in higher education administration: Part of the power or part of the problem? CUPA Journal, 41 (4), 9-15.

Denzin, Norman K. & Lincoln, Yvonna S., editors (1994). Handbook of Qualitative Research. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Diaz-Bolet, E.L. (1999). A study of selected factors related to mentoring women administrators in Christian colleges and Universities (DIA, 60, No. 04A). Fort Worth: Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary.

Digest of Education Statistics (1999). Postsecondary Education. Available: <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2000/digest99/d99t228.html> [2000, July 6].

Dublon, F.J. (1983). Women doctoral students in higher education administration: Life-style aspirations and multiple role commitments. Journal of NAWDAC 47 (1), 20-24.

Etaugh, C. (1984). Women faculty and administrators in higher education: Changes in their status since 1972. Journal of NAWDAC, 48 (1), 21-25.

Ezrati, J.B. (1983). Personnel policies in higher education: A covert means of sex discrimination? Educational Administration Quarterly, 19 (4), 105-119.

Fitzgerald, L.F. & Crites, J.O. (1980). Toward a career psychology of women: what do we know? What do we need to know? Journal of Counseling Psychology, 27 (1), 44-62.

Garlett, M.W. (1997). Waiting in the Wings: Women of God in the Evangelical Community (DAI, 58, No. 03A). Azusa: Azusa Pacific University, the Claremont School.

Gaustad, E.S. (1990). A Religious History of America. San Francisco: Harper Collins.

Gilligan, Carol (1977). In a different voice: Women's conceptions of self and morality. Harvard Educational Review, 47, 481-517.

Gold, A. (1996). (Women and) Educational Management. Paper presented at the meeting of the Gender Equality for 2000 and Beyond, Dublin, Ireland.

Harvey, W.B. & Stiff, L.V. (1985). Examining opportunities for mobility for professional staff in state universities. Innovative Higher Education, 10, 14-22.

Hawk, P.A. (1995, September). Lessons from the top: 15 women who have made it share their stories. A multiple case study. Paper presented at the meeting for the Annual Women in Leadership, Lincoln, NE.

Hersi, D.T. (1993). Factors contributing to job satisfaction for women in higher education administration. CUPA Journal, 44 (2), 29-35.

Hopson, C. (1995). Mentoring new administrators. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern States Communication Association, New Orleans, LA.

Ironside, E.M. (1983). Women as administrators in higher education: qualitative data for value questions. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Washington, D.C.

Ironside, E.M. (1981). Uncommon women/common themes: Career paths of upper level women administrators in higher education institutions. Paper presented at the joint conference of the Southern Association for Institutional Research, Charlotte, NC.

Johnsrud, L.K. (1991). Administrative promotion. Journal of Higher Education, 62 (2), 119-149.

Jones, S.W. (1987). Women Administrators: The myths don't match the facts. CUPA Journal, 38 (1), 1-4.

Kaplan, S. & Tinsley, A. (1989). Women in administration of higher education. Academe, 75 (1), 18-22.

Knopp, L. (1995). Women in higher education today. Research Briefs, 6 (5), 1-11.

Kuyper, L.A. (1987). Career development of women in the administration of higher education: Contributing factors. Journal of NAWDAC, 3-7.

Lafontaine, E. & McKenzie, B.J. (1985). Being out on the inside in higher education administration: Women's responses to role and status incongruity. Journal of NAWDAC, 48 (2), 19-25.

LeCompte, M. & Schensul, J.L. (1999). Designing & Conducting Ethnographic Research. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Lumsden, D.B., Plotts, J.G., Wells, C.R., & Newsom, R.W. (2000). Profiling the presidents of Christian colleges and universities: A comparative study. Journal of Research on Christian Education, 9, 61-74.

MaCaul, S. & Dunlap, W.P. (1988). Women in education: Pathways to advancement. Journal of Education, 109, 231-238.

Mann, J. & Smith, C. (1990). Prewiring for academic failure: Barriers to advancement to administrative positions in higher education. CUPA Journal, 41 (1), 25-30.

Marshall, C. & Rossman, G.B. (1999). Designing Qualitative Research, 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Marshall, M.R. & Jones, C.H. (1990). Childbearing sequence and the career development of women administrators in higher education. Journal of College Student Development, 31, 531-37.

Maxwell, J.A. (1996). Qualitative Research Design: an interactive approach. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Moore, K.M. (1983). Leaders in transition: A national study of higher education administrators. Report no. 83-711. Pennsylvania: Center for the Study of Higher education, the Pennsylvania State University.

Murrell, P.H. & Donohue, W.G. (1982). The life cycles and career stages of senior-level administrative women in higher education. (Report No. NIE-G-79-0085). Memphis, TN: Memphis State University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 219-018).

National Center for Educational Statistics (2000). Trends in Educational Equity of Girls and Women. NCES 2000-030. Available: <http://www.nces.gov>.

North, J.D. (1991). Strangers in a strange land: Women in higher education administration. Initiatives, 54 (2), 43-53.

Ost, D.H. & Twale, D.J. (1989). Appointments of administrators in higher education: Reflections of administrative and organizational structures. Initiatives, 52 (2), 23-29.

Phillips, S.D. & Johnston, S.L. (1985). Attitudes toward work roles for women. Journal of College Student Personnel, July, 334-338.

Powney, J. (1997). On becoming and being a manager in higher education. In Eggins, H.(Ed.), Women as Leaders and Managers in Higher Education (pp. 49-62). Buckingham, MK: SRHE and Open University Press.

Roey, S. & Skinner, R.R. (2000). Fall Staff in postsecondary institutions, 1997. Education Statistics Quarterly. Available: <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2000/qrtlyspring/5post/q5-6.html> [2000, May 30].

Sagaria, M.D. (1988). Administrative mobility and gender. Journal of Higher Education, 59 (3), 305-26.

Scanlon, K.C. (1997). Mentoring women administrators: breaking through the glass ceiling. Initiatives, 58 (2), 39-59.

Schaller, L., ed. (1982). Women as Pastors. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Schmitt, D.M. (1994). Integrating new theory & practice to prepare women for roles in educational administration. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Chicago, IL.

Schneider, A. (2000). U. of Oregon settles lawsuit over maternity leave. The Chronicle of Higher Education, July 21, 1-2.

Schneider, A. (2000). Faculty Union at California State U. charges that merit-pay system favors men. The Chronicle of Higher Education, July 21, 1-3.

Sederberg, N. & Mueller, C. (1992). Career paths of women administrators: The intersection of work and family. Paper presented at the annual conference of the National Council on Family Relations, Orlando, FL.

Slimmer, V.M. (1984, November). Advancement factors of women in administration: Patterns and perspectives. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Stonewater, B.B. (1987). Career traits, decision style, and Gilligan: Implications for counseling women. Journal of NAWDAC, 50 (2), 17-26.

Street, S. & Kimmel, E. (1999). Gender role preferences and perceptions of university administrators. NASPA Journal, 36 (3), 222-239.

Swoboda, M.J. & Millar, S.B. (1986). Networking-mentoring: Career strategy of women in academic administration. Journal of NAWDAC, 50 (1), 8-13.

Tetreault, M.K.T. (1986). The journey from male-defined to gender balanced education. Theory into Practice, 25 (4), 227-234.

Tinsley, A. (1985). Upward mobility for women administrators. Journal of NAWDAC, 49 (1), 3-11.

Twale, D.J. (1992, March). An analysis of higher education administrative appointments: A focus on women from 1986-1991. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Hilton Head, SC.

Twombly, S. (1986, April). Theoretical approaches to the study of career mobility: Applications to administrative career mobility in colleges and universities. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Warner, R. & Defleur, L.B. (1993). Career paths of women in higher education administration. In Mitchell, P.T. (Ed.), Cracking the Wall (1-18). Washington: The College and University Personnel Association.

Warner, R., Brazzell, J., Allen, R., Bostick, S., & Marin, P. (1988). Career paths in higher education administration. Paper presented by the Oakland University Chapter of the American Council on Education/National Identification Program Career Paths Research Committee.

Wilson, J. (1990). Moving in and moving up: Women in higher education in the 1990's. In New Directions for Higher Education (pp. 67-72). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Women in Higher Education (2000). Women as CEOs of higher education schools/campuses, 1995. Available: <http://www.wihe.com/stats2.htm> [2000, July 7].

Women in Higher Education (1998). Gender differences in 1998-1999 Administrative Salaries. Available: <http://www.wihe.com/stats98.htm> [2000, July 7].

Woo, L.C. (1985). Women administrators: Profiles of success. Phi Delta Kappan, 285-288.

Wright, C.A. & Wright, S.D. (1987). The role of mentors in the career development of young professionals. Family Relations, 36 (2), 204-208.

Yeakey, C.C., Johnston, G.S., & Adkison, J.A. (1986). In pursuit of equity: A review of research on minorities in educational administration. Educational Administrative Quarterly, 22 (3), 110-149.