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Abstract

Using a phenomenological methodology, this qualitative study renewed the examination of gender inequality in higher education administration by allowing women who have experienced the glass ceiling phenomenon at Research Doctoral institutions to provide further meaning by sharing their stories. The glass ceiling phenomenon reveals itself most clearly in higher education through the discrepancy between the number of women receiving advanced degrees and the number serving in academic leadership positions such as dean, vice-president for academic affairs, provost, chancellor, and, ultimately, president (Gerdes, 2006).

Overall, this study’s findings support previous research on gender inequality in higher education administration. The glass ceiling does not appear to manifest itself differently in 21st century higher education based upon the emergent themes—masculinized institutional culture, gendered organizational practices, intentionality, human capital, and career aspirations—drawn from the participants experiences with the phenomenon.

Since the problem of practice is ongoing and there has only been marginal progress in breaking down the barriers to obtaining higher level leadership positions, a new approach to generating understanding is required. Pierre Bourdieu’s social theory was used for this purpose. As a result, this study extended the body of knowledge on gender inequality in higher education administration by uncovering (a) the role capital plays in the emergence and maintenance of the glass ceiling in the 21st century higher education workplace, and (b) how the habitus of agents in the field is affected by the experience.
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Chapter One: Introduction

Statement of the Problem

Concern about gender inequality has been identified over time in a variety of contexts. Until the mid-1980s, there was no single term used by mainstream America to refer to the invisible barriers women face while attempting to obtain management level positions, particularly in corporate America. Magazine editor, Gay Bryant, first used the phrase, glass ceiling, to describe this phenomenon in a 1984 interview with Adweek (Barreto, Ryan, & Schmitt, 2009; Boyd, 2008). However, it was Carol Hymowitz and Timothy Schellhardt’s article, “The Corporate Woman: A Special Report,” in the Wall Street Journal that caused it to become a household name (Barreto, Ryan, et al., 2009; Boyd, 2008; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Glazer-Raymo, 1999; Jackson & O’Callaghan, 2009) and gave a generation of women a cause to rally around: breaking the glass ceiling.

The glass ceiling phenomenon reveals itself most clearly in higher education through the discrepancy between the number of women receiving advanced degrees and the number serving in academic leadership positions such as dean, vice-president for academic affairs, provost, chancellor, and, ultimately, president (Gerdes, 2006). In 2012, while 62.6% of master’s degrees and 53.3% of doctorates were conferred in the United States to females (National Center for Education Statistics, 2012), only 26% of presidents were women (Cook, 2012).

Singell and Tang (2013) found that “the internal leadership hierarchy within U.S. higher education is remarkably consistent across most universities such that it is relatively straightforward to compare the career trajectory of university presidents” (p. 220). The typical path to the presidency includes stops in senior faculty (e.g. associate professor or professor) and administration including department chair, dean, vice-president, and provost (American Council
Women are underrepresented in senior faculty and administrative positions, resulting in far fewer women than men in candidate pools for presidencies.” (Bornstein, 2008, p. 165) Thinking about this pipeline, it is noteworthy that only 43% of women in academia are tenured compared to 57% of men (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016), and 32.5% of women are in non-tenure track positions compared to 19.6% of men (Catalyst, 2015). Tenure, “a maximum period of probation not to exceed seven years for all faculty, with service beyond that period constituting continuous appointment” (Glazer-Raymo, 2007, p. 167) is normally granted upon appointment to senior faculty. Additionally, 52.2% of senior administrative positions are held by women at associate’s institutions versus 34% at doctoral granting institutions. Only 38% of chief academic officers, the most frequently held position before becoming president, are women (King & Gomez, 2008).

To better understand the problem of practice in the higher education context, this study explored the experiences of women who have undergone gender inequality while pursuing an academic deanship at Research Doctoral institutions.

**Justification.**

The lenses for studying gender inequality in higher education administration are diverse, and existing literature is embedded in numerous bodies of knowledge including women in college administration, higher education history, leadership, wage gap, sex discrimination in employment, and the glass ceiling. Some researchers approach this problem of practice by examining cultural barriers. Hegewisch, Liepmann, Hayes, & Hartmann (2010), for example, found that “after a considerable move towards more integrated occupations in the 1970s and 1980s, progress has completely stalled since the mid 1990s” (p. 1). Thus, occupational gender
segregation, defined as “the tendency for women to work in female occupations and men in male occupations” (Blackburn, Siltanen, & Jarman, 1995, p. 320) was found to be a contributing factor to the pipeline problem. In educational institutions, women often serve as deans in less prestigious disciplines such as nursing, social work, home economics, or education where the majority of the students are female (Finlay & Crosson, 1981; Kaplan & Tinsley, 1989; Turk, 1981). “They rarely serve as deans of business, engineering, or technology. Women, in short, are ‘clustered’ or ‘tracked’ within the structure of employment in our profession.” (Kaplan & Tinsley, 1989, p. 19).

O’Brien and Janssen (2005) characterize the problem of practice as, “administrative positions within higher education have been very homogeneous, reflecting an institutional culture in which males prevail” (p. 353). McTavish and Miller (2009) also believe that institutional, or organizational, culture plays an important role in this phenomenon. They looked at the impact of public sector reforms, such as the Equality Act 2006, on the United Kingdom’s further education (FE) sector, specifically organizational culture, job roles, and promotion practices, and concluded that the “modernization of the FE sector has introduced the type of managerialist reforms that perpetuates a culture of masculinity” (McTavish & Miller, 2009, p. 351). While studying the relationship between managers’ perceptions of work-family conflict and women’s promotability, Hoobler, Wayne, and Lemmon (2009) found that because of biases stemming from gender-based stereotypes “managers tend to view women as less promotable, poorer performers with poorer fit with their jobs and organizations” (p. 954). “Women, irrespective of their actual caregiving responsibilities, seem to be viewed as having greater caregiving responsibilities and greater family-work conflict than do men.” (Hoobler et al., 2009,
It is because of subtle, often unconscious biases that institutions of higher education undervalue and evaluate less favorably the contributions of women (Gresham, 2009).

Other researchers approach the study of gender inequality in higher education administration by examining more personal variables such as career aspirations, work-family conflict, and human capital such as credentials. For example, Brown (2005) asserted that talented women are often not “proactive and strategic in their career planning” (p. 664), and “mentors can help these women by planting seeds that would empower them to seek college president appointments” (p. 660). Lepkowski (2009), Eddy (2008), Kaplan & Tinsley (1989), Hill, Nash & Citera (2011), and Hoobler et al. (2009) cite the clash between work and family responsibilities as impacting career pathways. “The tenure timeline coincides perfectly with women’s prime childbearing years leading some women to feel forced to choose between their academic career and having children.” (Hill et al., 2011, p. 116) No matter what perspective—cultural, institutional or individual—is used to examine the problem of practice, evidence of its persistence exists.

As a result of the overall lack of progress surrounding this long-standing inequity, it was essential to renew an examination of gender inequality in higher education administration and allow women who have experienced the glass ceiling phenomenon at Research Doctoral institutions to provide further meaning by sharing their stories. By hearing directly from those that have experienced the phenomenon, this study produced knowledge on how the glass ceiling manifests itself in the 21st century higher education workplace. This knowledge presented as meanings and essences includes “the underlying and precipitating factors that account for what is being experienced” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 98). Revealing these factors and then conceptualizing them through the lens of Pierre Bourdieu’s social theory allowed this investigation to produce
implications for policy and practice on ways to mitigate and ultimately eliminate the glass ceiling phenomenon. Additionally, it derived “findings that will provide the basis for further research and reflection” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 47).

Audience.

For females working in higher education administration, this study will not only generate understanding of the phenomenon but provide meaning to those women that have experienced the glass ceiling while attempting to obtain a higher-level leadership position. This examination will also enlighten institutions of higher education on how the glass ceiling currently reveals itself so that policies, procedures and programs aimed at eliminating this inequity can be more accurately targeted. Finally, both policymakers and social scientists can benefit from the insights produced on social reproduction so that their work towards a more equitable society is strengthened.

Significance of Research Problem

Many incorrectly assume that higher education is more progressive than corporate America (Ballenger, 2010; Curtis, 2011). While the percentage of female college presidents has more than doubled since 1986, “the rate of change has slowed since the late 1990s” (Ballenger, 2010, Abstract section, para. 2). Additionally, Seliger and Shames (2009) found that “as the degree-level awarded by the institution rises, women’s representation at the top declines” (p. 19). Women hold 36% of community college presidencies compared to 22% at doctoral granting institutions (American Council on Education, Center for Policy Research and Strategy, 2017b), the focus of this study. The wage gap is also similar to that of corporate America. On average, female administrators earn 20% less than their male counterparts (Seltzer, 2017).
Internationally, conversations about gender inequality are strikingly similar. Studies focusing on women in higher education administration have been conducted in Australia (Bagillhole & White, 2008; Kjeldal, Rindfleish, & Sheridan, 2005); United Kingdom (Bagillhole & White, 2008; David & Woodward, 1998; Heward, 1996; Kettle, 1996; McTavish & Miller, 2009); South Africa (Ozkanli et al., 2009; White, Riordan, Özkanli, & Neale, 2010); Sweden (Kronsell, 2002); the European Union (Rees, 2007; Sagaria & Agans, 2007); Ireland (Linehan, Buckley, & Koslowski, 2009); Turkey (Gunluk-Senesen, 2009) and Pakistan (Rashid, 2010). One common theme among these studies is that “masculine organizational cultures and structures” (Ozkanli et al., 2009, p. 247) negatively impact women’s career progression which results in their “under-representation in positions of management” (Rashid, 2010, p. 208) in institutions of higher education. Another is the shift from overt discrimination to subtle biases. Rees (2007), for example, wrote that while reform movements have “fostered more progress in securing gender equality in European universities…the picture remains extraordinarily bleak, and hence this progress is slow. The biggest hurdle facing women pursuing academic careers in Europe in no longer direct but indirect discrimination” (p. 18). Linehan, Buckley and Koslowski’s (2009) research showed “repeated, though more subtle, forms of discrimination” (p. 414).

The reasons for eliminating gender inequality in higher education administration are rooted in social justice and human rights as well as leadership and economics.

The benefits of more women assuming presidencies extends beyond equity considerations or the importance of role models. The greater potential is that women may connect “the characteristic strengths of their gender to the power of their office.”69

Women can bring a different type of leadership to higher education, enabling institutions
to respond more effectively to the challenges of the new millennium. (Nidiffer, 2001c, p. 113)

Further research on this inequity is essential, since it still exists despite focused efforts over the past 50 years to level the playing field for women (Glazer-Raymo, 1999, 2007).

Positionality Statement

The researcher for this study transitioned from corporate America into higher education administration and experienced gender inequality in both of these contexts. In the early 1990s, the international financial services company where she worked routinely reinforced its male oriented culture by planning national sales incentive programs around a sports theme such as Major League Baseball’s World Series. She was encouraged to learn how to golf in order to be part of the team. In addition, her agency’s general manager routinely demeaned his female employees with much of his behavior elevating to the level of sexual harassment. As a higher education administrator, the researcher was passed over for a promotion to dean. The job went to a male colleague with less seniority and whose department was less profitable but was a mirror image of his predecessor—a white male, late 50s, married with children.

As a result of these experiences, the researcher gained firsthand knowledge about the lack of progress organizations have made in embracing the talents of women and creating more gender neutral organizational cultures. Personally, she is disappointed by these conditions and frustrated by the men who maintain this status quo. Professionally, it upsets the researcher that her credentials and accomplishments have not been equally recognized and rewarded through promotion to a higher-level leadership role. Over the years, she has often asked herself, “What am I doing wrong?” On her bedroom door growing up, the researcher had a poster that quoted William Arthur Ward. It stated, “If you can imagine it, you can achieve it. If you can dream it,
you can become it.” Despite the setbacks she has faced, the researcher still holds out hope that this is true not only for herself but for all women. Action is needed to change this situation. By examining the experiences of women in higher education administration who have experienced inequality, it is hoped that further understanding of this phenomenon will assist in reversing this condition.

In a phenomenological study, these experiences are considered researcher bias. It was critical that Epoche be used to “defeat bias that occurs from unexamined assumptions, personal or systematic prejudices, closed mindedness, and so on” (van Manen, 2014, p. 354). Central to the Epoche process is bracketing. In bracketing, past knowledge about the phenomenon is put aside and rendered non-influential (Vagle, 2014) in order for the researcher to focus “on the thing itself, its presence and elucidation” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 91) so that its essence can be revealed through this reflection.

To assist with validity, the researcher examined both supporting and discrepant data, “instances that cannot be accounted for by a particular interpretation or explanation” (Maxwell, 1996, p. 93), obtained from study participants. By doing this, she was able to determine “whether it is more plausible to retain or modify the conclusion, being aware of all of the pressures to ignore the data that do not fit your conclusions” (Maxwell, 1996, p. 93).

**Research Question**

The research question that guided this study is, “What are the lived experiences of women who pursued an academic deanship at Research Doctoral institutions with gender inequality?”

**Theoretical Framework**
For this study, the primary theoretical framework that was used is the social theory of Pierre Bourdieu (1930-2002). Bourdieu is known as one of France’s greatest scholars and one of the most influential social theorists in the world” (“Pierre Bourdieu,” 2012, para. 4). As a result, his book, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*, “was named one of the 20th century's 10 most important works of sociology by the International Sociological Association” (Riding, 2002, para. 12).

Pierre Bourdieu’s social theory was influenced by a wide variety of philosophers including Merleau-Ponty, Husserl, Durkheim, Marx, Kant, Weber, Pascal, Grouhier, Canguilhem, Bachelard, and Weill (Robbins, 2002). For example,

The extension of Weber’s idea of religious interest permits Bourdieu to develop concepts such as *religious capital* and *cultural capital* as irreducible forms of power though interchangeable with economic capital. With the concept of cultural capital, Bourdieu expands Weber’s idea of social closure to include more subtle, informal kinds of exclusionary practices.49 (Swartz, 1997, p. 42)

Later in his career, Bourdieu (2000) labels himself as a Pascalian. “I was thinking in particular of everything that concerns symbolic power, the aspect through which the affinity appears most clearly, and other, less often observed, facets of his work, such as the refusal of the ambition of foundation.” (Bourdieu, 2000, p. 2) It is difficult to place Bourdieu in one philosophical paradigm or school of thought. Sometimes Bourdieu is classified as a post-structuralist (“Alt Table of Contents,” 2012). In post-structuralism, “emphasis is placed on identifying meanings that are context specific and that relate to the varying discursive practices operating” (Fawcett, 2008, p. 667). Fowler (2000), on the other hand, categorizes him as a post-Marxist. While Marxism focuses on class based inequalities in power, post-Marxists study power differences...
created by access to education, technology, et cetera (DictionaryCentral, n.d.). Others such as Lizardo (2011) view him as a post-cultural anthropologist due to abandoning “the traditional parameters of cultural explanation in anthropology. He did this by developing a radically different conceptualization of what culture ‘is’ and of how ‘culture works’ (as well as how it is transmitted and acquired)” (Lizardo, 2011, p. 28). Despite the disagreement over his influences and proper classification, he “is without doubt considered one of the most influential figures in the study of culture today, with his influence being palpable across all fields dedicated to cultural analysis, from cultural and cognitive anthropology, to cultural studies and cultural sociology” (Lizardo, 2011, p. 27).

**Key concepts of Bourdieu’s social theory.**

In his book, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, Pierre Bourdieu (1984) discusses culture by analyzing survey data from France collected in the 1960s. As part of this analysis, he puts forth the equation, \[ \text{(habitus)} \times \text{(capital)} + \text{field} = \text{practice} \] (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 101), that summarizes his theoretical model and includes many of his key concepts. A discussion of these theories follows.

**Habitus.**

Habitus is the “structures constitutive of a particular type of environment (e.g. the material conditions of existence characteristic of a class condition)…systems of durable, transposable dispositions,\(^1\) structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures” (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 72). Skeggs (2004b) describes Bourdieu’s habitus as “opposite to conscious action and will-power.…the habitus is the product of strategies objectively co-ordinated [sic] by mechanisms unknown to the individual” (p. 83). An individual’s habitus is formed by his or her earliest experiences (Bourdieu, 1977; Skeggs, 2004a) and similar across members of a social
class or group (Bourdieu, 1977; Huppatz, 2006). Habitus has “an endless capacity to engender products – thoughts, perceptions, expressions, actions – whose limits are set by the historically and socially situated conditions of its production” (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 95). In *Masculine Domination*, Bourdieu (2001) cites habitus’ resistance to change as one of the reasons a gendered social order still exists.

The constancy of habitus that results from this is one of the most important factors in the relative constancy of the structure of the sexual division of labor: because these principles are, in their essentials, transmitted from body to body, below the level of consciousness and discourse, to a large extent they are beyond the grip of conscious control and therefore not amenable to transformation or corrections. (Bourdieu, 2001, p. 95)

**Field.**

For Bourdieu, “field refers to a structured system of social positions occupied by either individuals or institutions engaged in the same activity. Fields are structured internally in terms of their power relations” (Thorpe, 2009, p. 496). A field, sometimes referred to as social space, “can be presented as a diagram…to give a bird’s-eye view, a point of view on the whole set of points from which ordinary agents (including the sociologist and his reader, in their ordinary behaviour) see the social world” (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 169). “The specific logic of a field is established in the incorporated state in the form of a specific habitus, or, more precisely, a sense of the game…which is practically never set out or imposed in an explicit way.” (Bourdieu, 2000, p. 11) Position in the field is determined by “volume of capital, composition of capital, and change in these two properties over time (manifested by past and potential trajectory in social space)” (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 114).
Individuals do not move about in social space in a random way, partly because they are subject to the forces which structure the space (e.g., through the objective mechanisms of elimination and channeling), and partly because they resist the forces of the field with their specific inertia, that is, their properties, which may exist in embodied form, as dispositions, or in objectified form, in goods, qualifications, etc. (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 110). Basically, a field can be viewed as “the context in which action is taking place” (Mutch, 2006, p. 170) and “an arena for social struggles over both the distribution and the definition of the forms of capital that are specific to particular fields” (Serban, 2011, p. 250).

**Capital.**

Capital “refers to the forms of power held by social agents” (Laberge, 1995, p. 134) and used by “groups to remain dominant or gain status” (Dumais, 2002, p. 46). Each person possesses a unique mixture of capitals, “a consequence of complex relationships between individual and class trajectories” (Reay, 2004, p. 58). Bourdieu identified four primary forms of capital—economic, social, cultural, and symbolic (Duberley & Cohen, 2010; Dumais, 2002; Laberge, 1995; McCall, 1992; Reay, 2004).

Social capital is generated through social processes between the family and wider society and is made up of social networks. Economic capital is wealth either inherited or generated from interactions between the individual and the economy, while symbolic capital is manifested in individual prestige and personal qualities, such as authority and charisma (Bourdieu, 1985). (Reay, 2004, pp. 58-59) Education is the primary representation of cultural capital (Duberley & Cohen, 2010). Capitals can be exchanged for one and other.
However, the exchange rates vary in accordance with the power relation between the holders of the different forms of capital… the exchange rate of the different kinds of capital is one of the fundamental stakes in the struggles between class fractions whose power and privileges are linked to one or the other of these types. (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 125)

In addition, capitals carry a different weight “from one field to another—educational capital being most important in one area, economic capital in another…the specific logic of the field determines those which are valid in this market, which are pertinent and active in the game in question” (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 113).

**Practice.**

In Bourdieu’s model, practice is another word for action (Dumais, 2002). “Practices are not to be reduced to either habitus or field but grow out of the ‘interrelationship’ established at each point in time by the sets of relations represented by both.” (Swartz, 1997, p. 142) Probyn (2004) further defines practice as “frames for positioning oneself in the world, and indeed ways of inhabiting the world” (p. 229).

**Class.**

Class, also known as social class or constructed class, is defined as “a set of individuals who occupy an identical position and are engaged in the same collective trajectory” (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 112). Socio-occupational stratification is the primary organizing method for class. Gender, age, marital status, ethnicity, geographic place of residence are secondary properties (Bourdieu, 1984; Dumais, 2002; Laberge, 1995; Lovell, 2000; McCall, 1992; Skeggs, 2004a). However,
social class is not defined by a property…nor by a collection of properties…nor even by a chain of properties strung out from a fundamental property…but by the structure of relations between all the pertinent properties which gives its specific value to each of them and to the effects they exert on practices. (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 106)

Classification systems “function within and for the purpose of the struggle between social groups…classificatory schemes and systems which are the basis of the representations of the groups and therefore of their mobilization and demobilization” (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 479).

Focus on gender as a secondary, structuring criterion.

According to Bourdieu (2001), the division between the sexes “while arbitrary when taken in isolation, receives its objective and subjective necessity from its insertion into a system of homologous oppositions” (p. 7) and “appears to be ‘in the order of things’, as people sometimes say to refer to what is normal, natural, to the point of being inevitable” (p. 8).

The awakening of consciousness of sexual identity and the incorporation of the dispositions associated with a determinate social definition of the social functions incumbent on men and women come hand in hand with the adoption of a socially defined vision of the sexual division of labour. (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 93)

Bourdieu (1984) also writes that

sexual properties are as inseparable from class properties as the yellowness of a lemon is from its acidity: a class is defined in an essential respect by the place and value it gives to the two sexes and to their socially constituted dispositions. This is why there are as many ways of realizing femininity as there are classes and class fractions, and the division of labour between the sexes takes quite different forms, both in practices and in representations, in the different social classes. (pp. 107-108)
McCall (1992) clarifies Bourdieu’s position on gender when she writes, “this is to suppose that gender is not a form of capital. In fact, age and gender are considered general, biological forces which obtain specificity from social class position” (p. 841).

**Social reproduction.**

Social reproduction refers to “how and why relationships of inequality and domination are reproduced through or within groups” (Macris, 2011, p. 25). Bourdieu (1984) defines reproduction strategies as “the set of outwardly very different practices whereby individuals or families tend, unconsciously and consciously, to maintain or increase their assets and consequently to maintain or improve their position in the class structure” (p. 125). Reproduction strategies are used in cultural production to explain “how social inequality becomes constant (constancy of structure) and manifestly present—as meaningful cultural practice—in school and social life” (Dillabough, 2004, p. 492).

Once a system of mechanisms has been constituted capable of objectively ensuring the reproduction of the established order by its own motion (apo tou automatou, as the Greeks put it), the dominant class have only let the system they dominate take its own course in order to exercise their domination. (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 190)

Social reproduction is tied to habitus, because “in situations where opportunities and constraints are quite similar to the situation in which the dispositions of habitus were first internalized, habitus will tend to produce practices that correspond to existing structures” (Swartz, 1997, p. 213). Dumais (2002) concurs, “on the basis of the class position they were born into, people develop ideas about their individual potential….These beliefs are then externalized into actions that lead to the reproduction of the class structure” (p. 46).

**Masculine domination.**
In 2001, Pierre Bourdieu released his book, *Masculine Domination*, in English. Originally published as an article in France in 1990 then as a book in 1998 (Krais, 2006), it focuses on gender inequality, specifically “a question that is raised by most commentators (and most of my critics) – that of (observed or desired) permanence or change in the sexual order” (Bourdieu, 2001, p. vi). Intended to “clarify, support and correct my previous arguments on the same subject” (Bourdieu, 2001, p. vi), this work instead “evoked strong criticism from feminist scholars who argued that it presents an ahistorical, androcentric worldview and is ‘largely restricted to analyzing the structural constraints of masculine domination’ (Fowler, 2003. p. 479)” (Thorpe, 2009, p. 492). In addition, instead of focusing on the “living conditions, practices, views and struggles” (Krais, 2006, p. 122) of contemporary women, Bourdieu rooted his analysis in his observation of Kabyle society in the late 1950s as well as “Virginia Woolf’s description of a bourgeois British family at the beginning of the 20th century (in her novel *To the Lighthouse*, 1927)” (Krais, 2006, p. 123).

The social world, according to Bourdieu (2001), is organized by “a system of homologous oppositions” (p. 7) that includes masculine/feminine as well as dominant/dominated classes (Skeggs, 2004a, p. 22). He traces the opposition between male and female to the *biological* difference between the *sexes*, i.e. between the male and female bodies, and, in particular, the *anatomical* difference between the sex organs, can thus appear as the natural justification of the socially constructed difference between the *genders*, and in particular of the social division of labour. (Bourdieu, 2001, p. 11)

Bourdieu (2001) further describes the relationship between males and females as one of “domination and exploitation” (p. 30).
Far from asserting that the structures of domination are ahistorical, I shall try to establish that they are the product of an incessant (and therefore historical) labour of reproduction, to which singular agents (including men with weapons such as physical violence and symbolic violence) and institutions – families, the church, the education system, the state – contribute. (Bourdieu, 2001, p. 34)

Symbolic violence “is the gentle, hidden form which violence takes when overt violence is impossible” (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 196). “It is for the most part exerted invisibly and insidiously through insensible familiarization with a symbolically structured physical world and early, prolonged experience of interactions informed by the structures of domination.” (Bourdieu, 2001, p. 38) Krais (2006) further explains that domination due to symbolic violence can only occur “when both agents, dominants and dominated, have integrated into their habitus the symbolic order that generates the corresponding actions” (p. 122).

The relative permanence of masculine domination is due in part to the reproduction strategies of “institutions charged with ensuring the perpetuation of the order of the genders” (Bourdieu, 2001, p. 85), specifically the family, the church and the educational system. As mentioned previously, it is also tied to “the constancy of habitus” (Bourdieu, 2001, p. 95).

The symbolic revolution called for by the feminist movement cannot be reduced to a simple conversion of consciousness and wills. Because the foundation of symbolic violence lies not in mystified consciousness that only need to be enlightened but in dispositions attuned to the structure of domination of which they are the product, the relation of complicity that the victims of symbolic domination grant to the dominant can only be broken through a radical transformation of the social conditions of production of
the dispositions that lead the dominated to take the point of view of the dominant on the
dominant and on themselves. (Bourdieu, 2001, pp. 41-42)
The fundamental relationship between men and women can be changed, however, through
political action that really takes account of all the effects of domination that are exerted
through the objective complicity between the structures embodied in both women and
men and the structures of the major institutions through which not only the masculine
order but the whole social order is enacted and reproduced. (Bourdieu, 2001, p. 117)
Only social movements can produce the type of political action to which Bourdieu refers.
Individual effort is not powerful enough and, therefore, not recognized (Krais, 2006).

**Bourdieu reinterpreted by feminists.**

The term, feminism, refers to “both an intellectual commitment and a political movement
that seeks justice for women and the end of sexism in all forms” (Haslanger, Tuana, & O’Connor,
2012, para. 1). While feminism comes in many forms including liberal feminism, radical
feminism, body studies, lesbian issues, feminist literary criticism, feminist epistemology, and
post-colonialism (Switala, n.d.), they all are “motivated by the quest for social justice”
(Haslanger et al., 2012, para. 1). During the 1970s in the United States, feminists in academia
generally disengage with social theory and move towards various forms of cultural
theory. And this move was made precisely because of the exposure of the limits of
sociological concepts such as gender or social structure for feminist analysis (Barrett,
1992). (Adkins, 2004a, p. 4)

Since the late 1990s, feminist writers such as Judith Butler, Beverly Skeggs, Terry Lovell, Leslie
McCall, and Lois McNay have chosen to “use, critique, critically extend and develop Bourdieu’s
social theory to...address both ongoing and key contemporary problematics in contemporary
feminist theory” (Adkins, 2004a, p. 3). This interest is the result of a “renewed relationship between feminist and social theory” (Adkins, 2004a, p. 5). Lovell (2004) feels feminists are attracted to Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology “because of his integrated approach to socio-economic class and culture” (p. 41). Witz (2004) cites an “emerging consensus amongst some feminist commentators that the Bourdieun concept of gender habitus is a potentially fertile one for feminist theory (Krais 1995; Lovell, 2000, 2003; McNay, 2000; Moi, 1999)” (p. 211). It is Skeggs (2004a), however, that makes the most compelling connection between Pierre Bourdieu’s social theory and feminism as well as demonstrating the usefulness of his work as a theoretical framework.

So what does Bourdieu offer? Primarily explanatory power that is not offered elsewhere. He has consistently worked with three major strands. Firstly, the linking of objective structures to subjective experience (necessity and will, or structure and agency), an issue that has dogged feminists, philosophers and sociologists for some time. Secondly, his metaphoric model of social space in which human beings embody and carry with them the volumes and compositions of different capitals enables us to think through different types of values and mobility. Thirdly, his methodological insights, in which reflexivity, as a prerequisite to knowledge, provides us with a way of examining the positions from which we speak; a requirement that has always been at the heart of feminists critiques of masculine-dominated research agendas. (Skeggs, 2004a, p. 21)

At the end of the day, this enthusiasm for Bourdieu’s work must be balanced against the criticism he receives from feminists, especially his views on masculine domination outlined earlier in this chapter.
While feminist theory is not a primary theoretical framework for this study, the reinterpretation of Bourdieu undertaken by these feminist writers is referenced. Since “gender as an organizing principle is not given systematic treatment throughout Bourdieu’s work because gender division is seen as universal and natural, one of the relations of domination that structures all of social life” (McCall, 1992, p. 851), the viewpoints of this group are an important counterbalance to Bourdieu’s seminal theories.

The use of Pierre Bourdieu’s social theory required a qualitative study in order to examine the research question, “What are the lived experiences of women who pursued an academic deanship at Research Doctoral institutions with gender inequality?” This question sought to uncover the role capital played in constructing the participants’ experiences as well as how their habitus was affected by them.

In a preliminary review of the literature, only one similar study was located. Mata (1997) used Bourdieu’s social reproduction theory to investigate the experiences of both male and female Latino community college presidents. The focus was, therefore, on race not gender. As a result, a qualitative study using Bourdieu’s work to examine the experiences of women in higher education administration with gender inequality, specifically the glass ceiling, served to move the problem of practice forward toward a potential for action.
Chapter Two: Literature Review

Previous research has shown that gender inequality persists in the higher education context. Seliger and Shames (2009), for example, found that “as the degree-level awarded by the institution rises, women’s representation at the top declines” (p. 19). Consequently, women hold 36% of community college presidencies compared to 22% at doctoral granting institutions (American Council on Education, Center for Policy Research and Strategy, 2017b). Additionally, while women make up approximately 49% of the college-educated workforce (Warner, 2015) and earn 52.2% of all doctoral degrees awarded (Perry, 2015), they hold only 25% of presidencies nationwide, “a share that has remained about the same for at least a decade” (June, 2015, para. 4). The American Council on Education (n.d.) reported that the number of women serving as chief academic officers in public doctoral granting institutions, a stepping stone on the pathway to the presidency, declined by 7.2% between 2008 and 2013. To better understand this problem of practice, this study examined the experiences of women who have undergone occurrences of gender inequality while pursuing an academic deanship at Research Doctoral institutions.

While this investigation focused on the higher education context, a macro level understanding of the problem of practice was also pursued. Therefore, literature exploring gender inequality in the U.S. workplace is referenced when appropriate.

The literature review is organized to pursue key questions regarding gender inequality in higher education administration. They are: (a) historical information on the role of women in the U.S. workplace and higher education, highlighting what has changed and where progress has stalled; (b) evolution of the term, glass ceiling; and (c) barriers to women’s advancement in
higher education leadership. By analyzing what is currently known about the problem of practice, a “conceptual context” (Maxwell, 1996, p. 26) is developed for the research study.

The chapter concludes by summarizing key points and presenting how this study adds to the current body of knowledge by filling an identified gap in the literature. Gaps can take the form of “a void in existing literature, establish a new line of thinking, or assess an issue with an understudied group or population” (Creswell, 2007, p. 102).

History

Women in the workplace.

Gender inequality has existed for centuries, but its significance as a social issue in the United States dramatically increased in the 1800s after the industrial revolution as the nation began shifting away from an agricultural economy (Baker Library, Harvard Business School, 2010; Guilder, 1986; Wells, n.d.).

In addition to prompting many women to take paid work outside the home, the industrial revolution changed the cultural and economic value of unpaid “housework.” Although much of the actual work that women performed in the “domestic sphere” remained the same across the 19th century—cooking, cleaning, caring for children, maintaining family social relationships, and otherwise managing the household economy—culturally it lost much of its former value. (Wells, n.d., Answer section, para. 4)

This section addresses the questions of how the problem of practice has changed over time and what evidence exists that documents its ongoing significance.

The women’s suffrage movement, sometimes referred to as first wave feminism (V. Taylor, 1989), traces its history back to the work of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucretia Mott who organized the Seneca Falls convention on women’s rights in 1848. By 1917, 13 states gave
women the right to vote including New York, California and Illinois. The Nineteenth Amendment to the Constitution which gave women full voting rights was passed in 1919 and ratified in 1920 (History, Art & Archives, U.S. House of Representatives, Office of the Historian, 2007). While women had succeeded in winning the right to vote, few employment options were available to women in the early 1900s. There was an underlying ideology about women and men that allocated the public realms of work and politics to men and that defined women’s proper place in society as fundamentally domestic. With women confined to the realm of the home, their responsibility to society lay in raising virtuous sons (future citizens) and dutiful daughters (future mothers).

(Evans, 2006, para.4)

Consequently, most working women were either teachers, secretaries or nurses.

During World War II, “women began to assume, at least temporarily, significantly different roles outside the home in society” (Olcott & Hardy, 2006, pp. 11-12). Men were called off to war, and women took over their jobs in factories around the nation. Rosie the Riveter “was a role model for women supporting the war effort” (Olcott & Hardy, 2006, p. 12). When the war ended, men returned to their civilian jobs and women went back to working in the home.

By the 1960s, more women out of both choice and necessity entered the paid workforce, and they were dissatisfied with the disparities they faced. In 1961, President John F. Kennedy established the Presidential Commission on the Status of Women by Executive Order 10980. The Commission’s “1963 report highlighted discriminatory practices against women” (Glazer-Raymo, 1999, p. 13) and that “protective legislation should be strengthened” (Noble, 2012, p. 31). This finding along with the ongoing civil rights movement and the publishing of Betty Friedan’s book, The Feminine Mystique, in 1963 (Olcott & Hardy, 2006) created fertile ground
for second wave feminism to emerge in the mid-1960s (Baer, 2007; V. Taylor, 1989; Thompson-Adams, 2012). Among other things, feminists were advocating for “fairness in employment practices” (Bolzendahl & Myers, 2004, p. 763). An organization that would come to the forefront during this period was the National Organization of Women founded in 1966 (National Organization for Women, n.d.).

As second wave feminists organized and the women’s movement regained strength, a number of significant pieces of legislation were enacted related to their cause. These included:

- the Equal Pay Act of 1963 which “mandated equal pay for equal work on jobs requiring equal skill, effort, and responsibility, performed under similar working conditions” (Benokraitis, 1998, p. 4);
- Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which prohibited employment discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin (Benokraitis, 1998; Collins, 1998; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Easterly & Ricard, 2011; Glazer-Raymo, 1999, 2007; Jackson & Leon, 2010; Lens, 2003; Lockwood, 2004; Schmitt, Spoor, Danaher, & Branscombe, 2009; Scholnick, 1998); and

By the end of the decade, 43% of women worked outside the home compared to 25% in 1940 (Discovery Education, 2015a).

Women entered the workforce in droves during the 1970s and participation in the women’s movement grew. In 1971, the Supreme Court ruled for the first time that “a law that discriminates against women is unconstitutional under the Fourteenth Amendment” (American
The Equal Employment Opportunity Act of 1972 modified Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1974 to include education institutions as well as state and local governments under the law (Iyer, 2009; 2000). Passed in 1972 but not implemented until 1975, Title IX of the Education Amendments prohibited discrimination on the basis of sex in any educational program or activity that receives federal funding (Benokraitis, 1998; Collins, 1998; Easterly & Ricard, 2011; Glazer-Raymo, 1999, 2007; Schmitt et al., 2009; Scholnick, 1998). First introduced in Congress in 1923 (Francis, n.d.), the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution was finally approved for ratification in 1972. Unfortunately, it lapsed in 1982 after failing to be ratified in three states (Glazer-Raymo, 2007; Noble, 2012).

While the women’s movement had a number of political wins in the 1970s and career opportunities for women were expanding, the average woman still experienced gender inequalities in the workplace including sexual harassment, limited chances for promotion and a wage gap. In 1979, women made 62% of men’s wages (Patten & Parker, 2012; Skillern, 2014; U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2015).

In the 1980s, the fight for gender equality moved from the statehouse to the conference room as the backlash against feminism began. Women found they had to fight for change from within organizations rather than publicly.

In the decade’s dismissive shorthand, feminism came to mean denigrating motherhood, pursuing selfish goals and wearing a suit. Whereas feminism was fashionable in the ‘70s, antifeminism became socially acceptable in the ‘80s. First the fundamentalist right, then the White House – and ultimately Hollywood, television and many journalists – held feminism responsible for “every woe besetting women,” Faludi writes, “from mental
depression to meager savings accounts, from teenage suicides to eating disorders to bad complexions.” (Gibbs, 2001, Behind the Backlash section, para. 2)

Some researchers such as Judith Glazer-Raymo (1999) attribute this cultural shift to “ethnic politics” (p. 34) supplanting the women’s movement. However, the AIDS epidemic and war on drugs demanded their time in the spotlight during this period as well. Due to the economics of the era, 69% of women 18 to 64 worked compared to 33% in 1950 (Gibbs, 2001).

While the term, glass ceiling, was first used in 1984 by magazine editor, Gay Bryant, in an interview with Adweek (Barreto, Ryan, et al., 2009; Boyd, 2008), it was not until 1991 that the U.S. Department of Labor officially defined glass ceiling “as those artificial barriers based on attitudinal or organizational bias that prevent qualified individuals from advancing upward in their organization into management level positions” (p. 1). Additional research was published by the Glass Ceiling Commission (Glazer-Raymo, 1999; Jackson & O'Callaghan, 2009) in 1995 that showed

this type of discrimination followed from beliefs about women that restricted their access to high-level employment opportunities. Central to these beliefs was the conviction that it would be risky to invest in women because they might well quit their jobs to raise a family. (Eagly & Carli, 2007)

During the mid-1990s, private organizations such as the Center for Creative Leadership and Catalyst began publishing research on the glass ceiling (Lockwood, 2004) as public discourse continued to move away from feminism and the women’s movement. By 1999, 46% of the U.S. workforce was women, and they were working in more career fields than ever (2015b). Unfortunately, the problem of gender inequality did not go away. For example, women were
still making 23.5% less than their male counterparts (Wall, 2000). It just seemed to become less important to American society.

Since the turn of the 21st century, stories of individual achievement by women such as Meg Whitman, Carly Fiorina and Condoleezza Rice have been used by national media to downplay the need for collective action against gender inequality. Concurrently, researchers found that progress in closing the gender wage gap and breaking the glass ceiling had slowed. For example, Seliger and Shames (2009) wrote in *The White House Project: Benchmarking Women’s Leadership* that “equality still remains out of reach. In fact, women have made strikingly little progress in advancing to the boardroom and the executive suites; in some sectors of the economy, their progress has been stalled for several years” (p. 5). The only significant legislation to address gender equality during this period is the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act of 2009 that restored “the protection against pay discrimination that was stripped away by the Supreme Court’s decision in *Ledbetter v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.*” (National Women's Law Center, 2013, p. 1).

In 2014, women comprised 46.8% of the labor force (U.S. Department of Labor, Women's Bureau, n.d.). Seven out of 10 employed adults believe that men and women are paid equally (Glassdoor Team, 2016), but in reality, women earn only 81% of the median wages paid to male full-time wage and salary workers (U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2016). Women hold 46% of entry level positions in corporate America but only 19% of C-suite jobs (LeanIn.Org & McKinsey & Company, 2016). The statistic is worse for S&P 500 companies where women are just 5.8% of CEOs (Catalyst, 2017). In addition, more women hold staff roles than line roles which are less likely to lead to the C-suite (LeanIn.Org & McKinsey & Company, 2015, 2016), and “some research finds that occupational integration has
slowed. According to one recent study, segregation among full-time, full-year workers did not decline substantially in the 2000s for the first time since the 1960s” (Parker, Morin, & Cohn, 2013, p. 25).

In 2015, the United States was ranked 28th by the World Economic Forum on gender equality because “over the past decade or so the country’s made little progress in closing the opportunity gap between the sexes” (Peck, 2015, para. 5). The United States’ ranking dropped to 45th in 2016 “due to a decrease on its Economic Participation and Opportunity score” (Leopold, Ratcheva, & Zahidi, 2016, p. 21). Globally, wage equality and labor force parity closed only “2% over the past 11 years” (Leopold et al., 2016, p. 30). At this rate, it will take the world 170 years to close the economic gap between the sexes, up from 118 years in 2015 (Cann, 2016). The United States is also just one of seven nations and the only industrialized democracy that has not ratified the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, a treaty first adopted by UN General Assembly in 1979 (Allen, 2015).

Sixty-seven percent of adults feel the United States needs to continue making changes to bring about equality in the workplace (Parker et al., 2013). In a joint study by LeanIn.Org and McKinsey & Company (2015), it was estimated that at the current rate of change “it will take twenty-five years to reach gender parity at the senior-VP level and more than one hundred years in the C-suite” (p. 3).

If better is good enough, then perhaps women should just relax and enjoy their hard-won status. When it comes to gender equality however, good can never be good enough. This is true in light of a few salient dynamics that distort the supposed gains women have already made and seriously undermine the possibility of women continuing to keep the equality they have won. (Thomas, 2011, p. 1)
Even modern trailblazers like Sheryl Sandberg, COO of Facebook and founder of LeanIn.org, feel there is more work to be done. “We are still saying this is right and fair. But we’ve been saying that for a long time and haven’t really gotten anywhere.” (Belkin, 2015, para. 11)

While acknowledging that women have made significant strides in the U.S. workplace since the 1800s, the literature reviewed overwhelmingly shows that gender inequality persists despite concerted efforts by several generations of women to eradicate it. In particular, progress has stalled over the past decade in obtaining a greater share of senior leadership positions (LeanIn.Org & McKinsey & Company, 2015; Warner, 2015), and women are struggling to maintain the gains already achieved (Skillern, 2014). Using this data as a foundation, the next section explores the history of women in U.S. higher education in order to determine if their experiences parallel those working in corporate America.

Women in higher education.

In late 11th century Europe, the first universities separate from the church were established (Università di Bologna, n.d.) by “groups of male scholars who laid the foundations of intellectual discipline, rational thought and scientific culture” (David & Woodward, 1998, p. 8). This tradition of all male higher education was brought to New World when Harvard was established in 1636 by the Massachusetts Bay Colony (The President and Fellows of Harvard College, n.d.). It was not until the 1820s that academies such as Troy Female Seminary and Mount Holyoke Seminary were founded to educate women as teachers and missionaries (Introcaso, 2001).

In 1837, Oberlin became the first coeducational college in the United States (Nidiffer, 2001b; Oberlin College, n.d.; Penney, Brown, & Oliveira, 2007), but it was not until the 1870s that coeducation became more widely accepted at private institutions. Public institutions,
especially those created after the passage of the Morrill Act in 1862, were quicker to embrace coeducation (Nidiffer, 2001b). The University of Iowa, for example, was coeducational when it opened in 1855 (The University of Iowa, n.d.). Women’s colleges were also chartered during this period including Vassar, Smith, Wellesley, and Bryn Mawr (Introcaso, 2001). By 1900, 35.9% of all college students in the United States were women (National Center for Education Statistics, 2015).

From 1900 to 1920, college attendance in the United States more than doubled and women accounted for 47.3% of the students (National Center for Education Statistics, 2015).

With this increase came a fundamental change in the motivation of many women who sought college degrees. Alongside the serious women students who eschewed marriage and family in favor of academic achievements and productive careers were many who valued a college education “as a way station to a proper marriage.” (Bashaw, 2001, p. 166)

In the 1930s through early 1950s, considerably more men than women decided to go to college. As a result of the Great Depression, “unemployment left many [men] with little else to do and a college degree could greatly enhance employability” (Goldin, Katz, & Kuziemko, 2006, p. 136). The GI Bill was used by World War II and Korean War veterans to go to college (Goldin et al., 2006). 723,328 women attended college in 1950, a dramatic increase from the 11,126 in 1870, but they only represented 29.6% of all college students. Women would begin making up this lost ground in the late 1950s, and by 1980, more women than men would go to college (National Center for Education Statistics, 2015).

Women have had, in general, less success working in institutions of higher education. As faculty members, there has been “slow—actually, very slow—progress…. [in] efforts to fully
involve women in the academic workforce” (Curtis, 2011, p. 2). Women are more likely than men to hold part-time or adjunct positions (Curtis, 2011; Glazer-Raymo, 2008; Penney et al., 2007; West & Curtis, 2006). Approximately 44% of full-time faculty positions go to women (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016), but they are more likely to be at 2-year colleges than doctoral granting institutions (Jackson & Leon, 2010; Jackson & O'Callaghan, 2009; West & Curtis, 2006). “The proportion of full-time faculty members with non-tenure-track appointments has steadily increased” (Curtis, 2011, p. 2) since 1996. In this context, women have been less likely to obtain tenure as well as the rank of full professor (Collins, 1998; Curtis, 2011; Glazer-Raymo, 2008; Jackson & O'Callaghan, 2009; Penney et al., 2007; West & Curtis, 2006). Approximately, 43% of women in tenure-track positions have tenure compared to 57% of men (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016). In 2014, 31% of full professor positions were held by women (Johnson, 2016). Additionally, female faculty members are paid approximately 20% less than their male colleagues (Floss, 2011; Lepkowski, 2009; Renzulli, Grant, & Kathuria, 2006; Scholnick, 1998) as well as promoted and tenured more slowly (Collins, 1998; Jackson & O'Callaghan, 2009; Lepkowski, 2009). It is problematic that women continue to be underrepresented in faculty, since “almost 70 percent of presidents have served as faculty members at some point in their academic careers” (King & Gomez, 2008, p. 1) and the typical pathway to the presidency includes a stop in senior faculty (American Council on Education, Center for Policy Research and Strategy, 2017a; Bornstein, 2008; Cook, 2012; Singell & Tang, 2013; Walton & McDade, 2001).

Deans of women, popular from the mid-1830s to late 1970s, are considered by some to be “the first senior women administrators on coeducational university campuses” (Nidiffer, 2001a, p. 136). They supervised female students in coeducational colleges until changing
organizational structures, financial constraints, relaxed housing rules, et cetera converged to cause staffing cuts. The restructured position, dean of students, was typically given to a man (Bashaw, 2001; Gresham, 2009; S. R. Jones & Komives, 2001; Nidiffer, 2001a). Because “academe is a masculinized context” (Madden, 2002, p. 123), women have historically been “clustered in low and mid-level stereotyped administrative positions…head librarian, nursing dean, bookstore manager, registrar, student financial aid director, home economics dean, and information office director (Van Alstyne and Withers 1977)” (Finlay & Crosson, 1981, p. 1). In 2006, 34% of senior administrative positions were held by women in doctoral granting institutions. Only 19.3% were dean of an academic college, and 23% were chief academic officer or provost. Women fared far better at associate’s institutions where 52.2% of senior administrative positions were held by women (King & Gomez, 2008). These statistics are counterintuitive since women have earned at least 40% of all doctorates granted each year since 1996 (Hoffer, Hess, Welch, & Williams, 2007).

Women do occupy the president’s office. The earliest female presidents were found at religiously affiliated institutions such as Wellesley, Bryn Mawr and Trinity College in the late 1800s (C. F. Brown, 2001). By 1979, 6.8% of all college presidents were women (Finlay & Crosson, 1981). In 1994, more than 200 years after it was chartered, the University of Pennsylvania became the first Ivy League school to name a female president (Seliger & Shames, 2009). A 1995 study showed that the number of women serving as college presidents grew to 16% (Walton, 1998). Twenty-three percent of college presidents were female in 2006 (Tufts Daily, 2007), but “policy changes have not advanced women in higher education as quickly as is desirable” (Madden, 2002, p. 143).
Currently, while women make up approximately 49% of the college-educated workforce (Warner, 2015) and earn 52.2% of all doctoral degrees awarded (Perry, 2015), they hold only 25% of presidencies nationwide, “a share that has remained about the same for at least a decade” (June, 2015, para. 4). Women fare better at community colleges where they are 36% of presidents compared to 22% at doctoral granting institutions (American Council on Education, Center for Policy Research and Strategy, 2017b). Overall, “women [in higher education] still lag significantly behind men in status, salary and leadership positions” (Seliger & Shames, 2009, p. 16).

The history of women in higher education mirrors that of women in corporate America. Progress in eliminating gender inequality has stalled over the past decade, especially with obtaining a greater share of senior leadership positions (June, 2015). Women’s hard fought for gains are also beginning to slip away. In an infographic brief written for the American Council on Education by Johnson (2016), it was reported that the number of women serving as chief academic officers, a critical stop on the pathway to the presidency, in public doctoral granting institutions declined by 7.2% between 2008 and 2013. Finally, the literature revealed clear links between broad social changes such as second wave feminism and Title IX of the Education Amendments and the advances women have made in higher education administration. It is, therefore, necessary to take into consideration how theorists have framed this problem of practice at the societal level when studying the higher education context. Since this study investigated one specific aspect of gender inequality—the barriers encountered when pursuing leadership positions, the next section explores how the literature has treated the glass ceiling phenomenon over time.

**Evolution of the Term, Glass Ceiling**
Women were aware of the invisible barriers they faced while attempting to obtain management level positions for decades before the phenomenon was finally named in 1984 when the phrase, glass ceiling, was first used by magazine editor, Gay Bryant, in an interview with *Adweek* (Barreto, Ryan, et al., 2009; Boyd, 2008).

The word *ceiling* implies that women encounter an upper limit on how high they can climb on the organizational ladder, whereas *glass* refers to the relative subtlety and transparency of this barrier, which is not necessarily apparent to the observer. (Barreto, Ryan, et al., 2009, p. 5)

The term was not popularized until 1987 when it was used in the Wall Street Journal article, “The Corporate Woman: A Special Report,” by Carol Hymowitz and Timothy Schellhardt (Barreto, Ryan, et al., 2009; Boyd, 2008; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Glazer-Raymo, 1999; Jackson & O'Callaghan, 2009). It took until 1991 for the U.S. Department of Labor to officially define glass ceiling “as those artificial barriers based on attitudinal or organizational bias that prevent qualified individuals from advancing upward in their organization into management level positions” (p. 1). While this definition remains the most widely used in the literature reviewed, researchers have conceptualized other ways to define the glass ceiling.

For example, Jackson and O'Callaghan (2011) and Maume (2004) follow the work of Cotter, Hermsen, Ovadia, and Vanneman (2001) that argues for a stricter definition of a glass ceiling that utilizes four criterion to distinguish a glass ceiling from other types of gender inequality. The criterion are: discrimination still exists “after controlling for education, experience, abilities, motivation, and other job-relevant characteristics” (Cotter et al., 2001, p. 657); discrimination increases in severity as one moves up in the occupational hierarchy; studies should use longitudinal data along with “dynamic models that measure change over time (e.g.,
England et al. 1988; Hannan, Schomann & Blossfeld 1990; Rosenfeld 1980), not just static comparisons of outcome levels” (Cotter et al., 2001, p. 660); and disadvantage increases over the course of a career.

A number of associated terms have been created for glass ceiling. The first is glass walls. This refers to women being concentrated in staff, or supportive, roles in an organization such as marketing or human resources that are not normally on the pathway to the C-suite (Barreto, Ryan, et al., 2009; Berry & Franks, 2010; David & Woodward, 1998; Eisner & Harvey, 2009). The next term, glass escalator (Eisner & Harvey, 2009; Schmitt et al., 2009), refers to the “tendency for men to ascend career ladders faster than women do even in female-dominated fields” (Eagly & Sczesny, 2009, p. 30). Finally, women who break through the ceiling often face a glass cliff. This means being selected to lead during times of crisis when there is a greater chance of failure and criticism (Bagilhole & White, 2008; Barreto, Ryan, et al., 2009; Eisner & Harvey, 2009; Madden, 2011; Ryan, Haslam, Hersby, Kulich, & Wilson-Kovacs, 2009).

As thinking about the phenomenon has advanced, two opposing viewpoints have emerged. The first group of researchers propose that the ceiling is made of Plexiglas (Berry & Franks, 2010; Quina, Cotter, & Romenesko, 1998), Teflon (Campbell & Lacost, 2010a) and Lucite (Johnson-Bailey & Tisdell, 1998). All materials that are much harder to break than glass. They see the barriers as more difficult to overcome that originally envisioned. The second group including Eagly and Carli (2007) and Lafreniere and Longman (2008) believe that the glass ceiling has been replaced by a labyrinth.

The glass ceiling has been cracked and shattered so many times and in so many contexts that it no longer makes sense to use this metaphor to portray the barriers that women encounter in the workplace. Women no longer face monolithic roadblocks that obstruct
all access to high-level positions. Yet impediments still exist, producing sometimes confusing and often indirect paths that women travel. Astute pathfinders maneuver through this labyrinth. (Eagly & Carli, 2007, p. 183)

For this group, barriers remain, but they are more surmountable.

Overall, researchers agree that barriers remain for women trying to obtain management positions, especially senior level leadership roles. The debate is over the permeability of these barriers. In the final section of this literature review, the numerous barriers that support the glass ceiling phenomenon and, ultimately, gender inequality are explored.

**Barriers to Women’s Advancement in Higher Education Administration**

Gender inequality is a complex problem that causes considerable disagreement among researchers over causes and remedies (Jackson & O'Callaghan, 2009). Like the studies by Timmers, Willemsen, and Tijdens (2010) and Ballenger (2010), the barriers are organized according to three factors—cultural, institutional and individual—that contribute to their creation.

**Cultural barriers.**

**Gender-based stereotypes.**

Psychologists have determined that sex, whether someone is male or female, is the first thing a person notices about another during social interaction. “It trumps race, age, and occupation in the speed and ubiquity of categorizing others.” (Eagly & Carli, 2007, p. 85)

The American Psychological Association (2011) defines gender as the “attitudes, feelings, and behaviors that a given culture associates with a person’s biological sex” (Introduction section, "Definition of Terms"). Consequently, when a person is categorized according to sex, mental associations, or expectations, about a person’s gender are evoked (Cikara & Fiske, 2009; Eagly
& Carli, 2007; Eagly & Sczesny, 2009; Easterly & Ricard, 2011). These expectations are referred to as gender-based stereotypes, and often, they occur “without any conscious awareness of them” (Eagly & Carli, 2007, p. 86), because the socialization process begins shortly after birth (Zhang, Schmader, & Forbes, 2009). Through socialization, stereotypes become internalized. These biases not only influence an individual’s interactions with others but their view of self. If a person is aware of their biases, however, affects can be mitigated (Madden, 2005).

Masculine and feminine associations, according to Eagly and Carli (2007) are “firmly rooted in in a society’s division of labor between the sexes….We can’t directly observe people’s traits, so we form impressions of people by looking at how they behave. We then assume that their behaviors reflect their personality” (p. 87). Women are described according to “communal qualities such as affectionate, helpful, friendly, kind, and sympathetic as well as interpersonally sensitive, gentle, and soft-spoken” (Eagly & Sczesny, 2009, p. 23). This positions them as caregivers focusing on “people, bonding, relationships and nurturing” (Eisner & Harvey, 2009, p. 18). Men, on the other hand, exhibit agentic “qualities such as aggressive, ambitious, dominant, self-confident, and forceful as well as self-reliant, self-sufficient, and individualistic” (Eagly & Sczesny, 2009, p. 23) that are correlated with power, competition, task accomplishment, competence, and, ultimately, leadership (Eisner & Harvey, 2009).

Madden (2011) provides different labels for these qualities, friendly for females and competent for males, and describes them as “bipolar opposites on a single trait dimension (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Goodwin & Fiske, 2001). That is, an individual can not [sic] be both competent and friendly: the choices are to be either competent and cold or incompetent and friendly” (pp. 55-56). Since male and female associations are perceived as incompatible,
paternalistic prejudice rewards women who are in traditional roles by attributing more socially desirable traits (e.g., patience, warmth) to them. In essence, warmth is a consolation prize for renouncing competition with men for social power. When women transgress traditional gender norms of femininity by taking on a nontraditional role, one way to penalize their gain in status or their competition is to cast their behavior in a negative light. (Cikara & Fiske, 2009, p. 78)

Gender-based stereotypes exist to help people make sense of the world around them. The problem arises when they are used to limit what someone “should, could, and can accomplish….When schemas turn into prescriptive roles, sexism and discrimination occur” (Easterly & Ricard, 2011, p. 64). In addition, members of high-status, or dominant, groups use stereotypes to maintain “social power and access to resources” (Cikara & Fiske, 2009, p. 75).

Stereotypes are shaped by the context in which they occur (Madden, 2011). Therefore, the potential for them to change exists. It has been found, however, that “psychological processes restrain the changes in groups' stereotypes that might otherwise follow from changes in their roles, with the consequence that stereotype change lags behind actual role change” (Eagly & Sczesny, 2009, p. 34). In regards to gender-based stereotypes, the beliefs considered sexist today “may be quite different from those that characterized older forms of sexism….In addition, social norms have changed in such a way that even those who believe in older forms of sexism are less likely to express them (Barreto, Ellemers, Cihangir, & Stroebe, 2009, pp. 101-102). This transition means that “prejudice is not necessarily explicit and overt but often implicit and covert” (Eagly & Sczesny, 2009, p. 27). Many researchers including Barreto, Ellemers, et al. (2009); Eisner and Harvey (2009); Glazer-Raymo (2007); Williams (2014); Bird (2011); Gerdes (2006); and Madden (2005, 2011) refer to this in the literature as subtle bias.
Occupational gender segregation.

One of the ways gender-based stereotypes affects equality in the workplace is through occupational gender segregation (Glazer-Raymo, 1999). Also known as horizontal segregation (McTavish & Miller, 2009), it is the tendency for men and women to be employed in different occupations—“men’s jobs and women’s jobs” (Berry & Franks, 2010, p. 5). While women are no longer “deliberately or explicitly barred” (Zhang et al., 2009, p. 126) from specific careers, they tend to be employed in “areas traditionally associated with stereotypically female interests and aptitudes” (McTavish & Miller, 2009, p. 353) such as education, nursing and human resources. Male-dominated professions tend to be related to science, technology, engineering, and math, often referred to as STEM. Occupational gender segregation is cited as a cause of the persistent wage gap between women and men (Blackburn et al., 1995; Hegewisch et al., 2010; Renzulli et al., 2006).

The internalization of stereotypes through socialization “influences women’s interest in and perception of different activities. These pressures can shape at an early age what girls envision themselves doing” (Zhang et al., 2009, p. 126). Parents, teachers and peers have the most influence on shaping beliefs, but a person also receives messages “through broader cultural associations and mere observations of who is likely to be employed in what kinds of professions” (Zhang et al., 2009, p. 129). Aspirations towards a masculine domain are, therefore, reduced by “socialization efforts that increase the salience of young girls' gender identity” (Zhang et al., 2009, p. 130). Subsequently, a person makes choices about education based upon their career aspirations that reflect “perceptions of their own competence at career-relevant tasks” (Haveman & Beresford, 2012, p. 121). A 2005 study by the American Association of University Women
Educational Foundation showed that “women and men select different majors” (Eisner & Harvey, 2009, p. 16) which, unfortunately, reinforces occupational gender segregation.

In 1999, Judith Glazer-Raymo cited in the seminal work, Shattering the Myths: Women in Academe, the persistence of occupational gender segregation as a factor limiting women’s advancement in professional schools (e.g. law and medicine) as “students, faculty, administrators, and future practitioners” (p. 101). Ten years later, McTavish and Miller (2009) similarly found that in higher education, “aspects of the teaching and learning role are often considered as an affinity with stereotypically feminine aptitudes and this can result in gender segregation of roles within the workplace to the disadvantage of women” (p. 359). Supporting the endurance of occupational gender segregation, Eisner and Harvey (2009) concluded in their study of Millennials’ perceptions of gender equity in the workplace that the “clustering of genders between occupations and within organizations can reinforce a cloistering, making it less likely that stereotypes will erode” (p. 25).

Even though there has been some positive change, Berry and Franks (2010) believe that “affirmative action and awareness-raising campaigns can help counter gender discriminatory attitudes” (p. 7) causing persistent occupational segregation. In addition, “the negative effects of gender stereotypes can be circumvented by instituting policies and interventions designed to change the social environments to which young girls and women are exposed” (Zhang et al., 2009, p. 139).

*Leadership.*

The expectations society has about leaders is another way in which gender-based stereotypes impede women’s progress in breaking the glass ceiling. Up until the 1950s, leadership was primarily explained by the Great Man Theory, popularized by historian, Thomas
Carlyle, during the 1840s—a time when women still did not hold positions of authority (Leadership-Central.com, n.d.). It asserts that leaders are born with a set of traits and abilities that allow “them to assume roles of authority and power” (Villanova University, n.d., para. 5). “Proponents…also believe that regardless of the innate talents potential leaders might possess, without the timely emergence of situational forces they will not become leaders.” (Cawthon, 1996, p. 3) Since “history is frequently written from the reference point of ‘great men’” (Borgatta, Bales, & Couch, 1954, p. 755), it is understandable how leadership became stereotypically equated with men and masculinity. While the study of leadership has evolved to include a multitude of theories including situational leadership, transformational leadership and leader member exchange theory, gender still plays a role in who we perceive to be leaders and preferred leadership styles.

Although managers and leaders technically serve different roles in an organization, a discussion that is outside the scope of this research, most literature on gender inequality uses these terms interchangeably. Therefore, it is important to mention the influential research of Virginia Schein (1975) that investigated the “relationships between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics” (p. 340). Her results confirmed a relationship between gender stereotypes and perceptions of requisite management characteristics….These outcomes showed that gender stereotyping was a major barrier to women’s entry into management in the USA. Women were perceived by male and female managers as less likely than men to possess the characteristics, attitudes, and temperaments required of successful managers. Characteristics such as leadership ability, desires responsibility, and objectivity were seen as requisite management characteristics and more likely to be held by men than by women. To “think manager”
was to “think male,” and this view worked against women seeking to enter and advance into management positions. (Schein, 2007, p. 8)

This research aligned with prior management theories including the work of John Milner by confirming that the role of manager is built upon masculine associations (Eagly & Carli, 2007).

Current literature on gender inequality continues to describe leadership as masculinized because the mental associations about leaders overlap significantly with those attributed to males (Berry & Franks, 2010; Bornstein, 2008; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Haveman & Beresford, 2012; Madden, 2005, 2011). “Leaders in general are viewed as possessing more masculine, agentic characteristics than feminine, communal characteristics.” (Eagly & Carli, 2007, p. 92) These masculine associations include “competing with peers, imposing their wishes on subordinates, behaving assertively, and standing out from the group (Miner 1993; Atwater et al. 2004)” (Haveman & Beresford, 2012, p. 124). In addition, men are viewed as more likely to use the key leadership characteristics of “inspiration, delegation, intellectual stimulation, and problem solving” (Madden, 2005, p. 5). Consequently, women striving for leadership roles are judged against male models of leadership (Eddy & Cox, 2008), and the “incongruity between leadership roles and female gender roles (i.e., prescriptive expectations for women’s behavior), leads to prejudicial judgements and actions (Eagly & Karau, 2002; Eagly, Karau, Miner, & Johnston, 1994)” (Madden, 2011, p. 61) towards them.

Because of gender-based stereotypes, women face a double bind when it comes to leadership (Bornstein, 2008; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Eddy, 2008; Eddy & Cox, 2008; Haveman & Beresford, 2012; Hoobler et al., 2009; Madden, 2005, 2011). “As women, they are expected to be communal, collaborative, and democratic: but as managers, they are expected to be agentic and authoritative.” (Haveman & Beresford, 2012, p. 125) While attempting to gain and use
influence, if women act in ways that support their gender role, such as exhibiting a “caring, consultative style, they are called weak and indecisive; when they adopt traditional authoritarian and directive behaviors, they are criticized for being too heavy-handed” (Bornstein, 2008, p. 172). As a result, Eagly and Carli (2007) believe that a woman who wants to break through the glass ceiling must develop a leadership style that strikes the right balance between the roles of woman and leader for her particular context.

Many researchers including Bagilhole and White (2008); Berry and Franks (2010); Ozkanli et al. (2009); and White et al. (2010) believe that leadership style is affected by gender. In higher education administration, as well as corporate America, women tend to utilize more collaborative styles while men select authoritative styles. These choices reflect the mental associations ascribed to and internalized by each gender. In their study of six female community college presidents, Eddy and Cox (2008) found that “not all elements of these women’s presidencies were male influenced. Traditional women’s ways of leading were also apparent. These feminized actions, however, still took place within a gendered organization” (p. 76). Similarly, Bagihole and White (2008) concluded in their analysis of senior managers at UK and Australian universities that “women’s preference for a different leadership style was clear” (p. 10). Women leaders were seen as more transformative with their style “characterized by soft skills” (Bagilhole & White, 2008, p. 8). Madden (2005, 2011) as well as Eagly and Carli (2007) caution that organizational context plays an important role in leadership style and can mediate some of the effects of gender. In organizations with few women leaders, women “very often lead much the same way as their male counterparts do.” It is when leader roles are more integrated that women are more likely to exceed men in displaying democratic, participative styles as well as interpersonally oriented styles” (Eagly & Carli, 2007, p. 133).
In order to eliminate the obstacles women face in obtaining leadership positions, the role gender-based stereotypes play must be acknowledged. Interventions developed must “target root causes and seek to correct the manifestations of gender bias” (Dominici, Fried, & Zeger, 2009, p. 27), because women who accept these stereotypes “are less likely to aspire to managerial positions (van Vianen and Keizer 1996; Davies, Spencer, and Steele 2005)” (Haveman & Beresford, 2012, pp. 124-125). In addition, “a means of moving forward is the expansion of organizational and leadership research that deconstructs the hegemonic norm of male leadership defining all leadership” (Eddy & Cox, 2008, p. 77).

**Institutional barriers.**

**Culture.**

Organizational culture is the shared beliefs, core values, symbols, goals, rituals, and traditions (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Olcott, 2006) that provide “meaning and direction to the organization and its members (Deal 1999)” (Olcott, 2006, p. 20). It guides behavior, affects practices, and influences decision making at all levels. Leaders are expected to reinforce culture “consistently and often” (Olcott, 2006, p. 20).

Researchers studying gender inequality posit that organizational cultures, structures, perspectives, expectations, and practices are gendered to the advantage of men (Bird, 2011; Bornstein, 2008; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Eddy, 2008; Eddy & Cox, 2008; Fenstermakeri, 2011; Gander, 2010; Linehan et al., 2009; McTavish & Miller, 2009). This occurs because social structures influence organizational context (Fenstermakeri, 2011). Consequently, gender-based stereotypes (Madden, 2005, 2011) as well as mental associations about leadership that skew towards men (Eagly & Carli, 2007; McTavish & Miller, 2009) are brought into the workplace and affect culture. “Practices evolve slowly, in a dynamic exchange with the beliefs of the
individuals who inhabit these organizations. Organizational practices and individuals’ beliefs continually shape one another.” (Eagly & Carli, 2007, p. 139)

Institutions of higher education were created, in some cases centuries ago, by men to serve men. They are proud of their histories and traditions (Easterly & Ricard, 2011; Eddy, 2008; LeSavoy & Bergeroni, 2011; Madden, 2011; Muñoz, 2010). While these organizations have evolved, male oriented practices and ideals remain (Ballenger, 2010; Bird, 2011; Bornstein, 2008; Easterly & Ricard, 2011; Eddy, 2008; Eddy & Cox, 2008; Glazer-Raymo, 1999; Ozkanli et al., 2009; Vaccaro, 2011; White et al., 2010) including a hierarchical division of labor (Ballenger, 2010; Bird, 2011; Eddy & Cox, 2008; Glazer-Raymo, 1999; S. J. Jones & Palmer, 2011; Madden, 2005, 2011; Singell & Tang, 2013; White et al., 2010) and the use of positional power (Eddy & Cox, 2008; S. J. Jones & Palmer, 2011; Madden, 2005, 2011). Sometimes the culture in higher education is referred to as a chilly climate where the contributions of women are devalued and subtle biases abound (Fenstermakeri, 2011; Sandler & Hall, 1986; Vaccaro, 2011). “Often, the behaviors themselves are small, and individually might even be termed ‘trivial’ or minor annoyances, but when they happen again and again, they can have a major cumulative impact.” (Sandler & Hall, 1986, p. 3)

Culture is resistant to change (Kjeldal et al., 2005; Muñoz, 2010; Williams, 2014) especially the aspects related to gender. “Male dominance has been treated as too obvious to discuss, leading to failure to thoroughly analyze how deeply embedded gender constructs are in organizations.” (Madden, 2011, p. 66) Masculinized organizational cultures persist because of “disjunctures between formal expectations and informal practices” (Bird, 2011, p. 207). Formal policies supporting diversity such as affirmative action, no matter how well written, are most often implemented at the departmental level where informal norms can undermine their success.
For example, candidates for employment are often judged on their perceived fit with the organization’s culture (Bagilhole & White, 2008; O’Brien & Janssen, 2005; Williams, 2014). This occurs because of homosocial reproduction, a process where dominant group members, especially leaders, tend to recruit new members that are like themselves (Bagilhole & White, 2008; Ballenger, 2010; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Gander, 2010; Glazer-Raymo, 1999; Hunt et al., 2009; Kjeldal et al., 2005; Muñoz, 2010). Homosocial reproduction not only influences who is hired into an organization but also who is promoted. Consequently, if an organization’s leaders are predominately white males then white males will be favored for promotion weakening any formal policies supporting gender equality.

Williams (2014) believes that “mitigating glass ceiling effects” (p. 76) is tied to organizational learning and change. Inequalities must be brought out into the open (Easterly & Ricard, 2011; Eddy & Cox, 2008; Gander, 2010; Hoobler et al., 2009; Kjeldal et al., 2005) so that training targeting “the subtle means by which systemic barriers are constructed and maintained” (Bird, 2011, p. 211) can be conducted. Accountability for gender equality is also required throughout the organization (Bornstein, 2008; Fenstermakeri, 2011; Linehan et al., 2009; U.S. Department of Labor, 1991; Williams, 2014) instead of delegated to a single diversity officer or office. Madden (2005) suggested that accountability can be achieved through rewards systems. Bagilhole and White (2008); Eagly and Carli (2007); and Bornstein (2008) caution, however, that until there is a critical mass of women in leadership positions in an institution, culture will not change.

Organizational practices.
Embedded in masculinized cultures are organizational practices that put women at a disadvantage. Studies cite everything from parental leave policies (Hill et al., 2011) to teaching loads (Bird, 2011; Glazer-Raymo, 1999; S. J. Jones & Palmer, 2011) as evidence of the gender inequalities in our institutions of higher education. Two of the most frequently discussed areas are (a) recruitment and promotion and (b) networks and mentoring.

There is a traditional and common pathway up higher education’s career ladder to the presidency (Krull, 2011; Lepkowski, 2009). It begins at faculty member and advances through program director, department chair, dean, chief academic officer including vice-president and provost, and ends at president (Ballenger, 2010; Campbell & LaCost, 2009; Dominici et al., 2009; Drake, 2008; Singell & Tang, 2013). Alternate routes are possible such as through student affairs or enrollment services (Eddy, 2008), but the most common position someone holds before becoming president is chief academic officer (Eddy, 2008; Glazer-Raymo, 1999; “Institutional Leadership,” 2009). In order to improve the pipeline, more women need to hold tenured faculty and lower level administrative positions (Bagilhole & White, 2008; Bornstein, 2008). Women with non-traditional backgrounds, who are typically passed over for presidencies, must also be considered (Bornstein, 2008; Glazer-Raymo, 1999).

To accomplish this goal, selection processes for new hires and promotion must become less subjective and more transparent. Search committees often rely on social networks and referrals to find candidates (Bagilhole & White, 2008; Eagly & Carli, 2007) which allows homosocial reproduction to influence who is hired. In addition, they “make stereotypical assumptions about candidates’ preferences, social needs, or professional or personal aspirations” (Williams, 2014, p. 78). Search committees, instead, should be “considering how to evolve
organizational culture” (Williams, 2014, p. 80) through the hiring process while simultaneously avoiding token hires.

Tokens are individuals “‘treated as representative of their category, as symbols rather than individuals’ (Kanter 1977, p. 208)” (Timmers et al., 2010, p. 722). Women in senior leadership positions including the presidency often have token status (Berry & Franks, 2010; S. J. Jones & Palmer, 2011; Linehan et al., 2009). Tokens experience intense performance pressure and extra scrutiny as well as increased stereotyping and gender discrimination (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Schmitt et al., 2009). In many ways, their success or failure represents the capabilities of an entire gender. “Tokenistic selection policies may nevertheless result in the perception that the organization is egalitarian—providing equal opportunities for advancement to women and men. Observing token successes may blur the perceptions of current gender inequality.” (Schmitt et al., 2009, p. 53)

Institutions of higher education must also examine the “developmental job experiences” (Eagly & Carli, 2007, p. 150) given to women in their organizations. One criteria for promotion into senior roles is line experience (Bornstein, 2008; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Olcott, 2006; U.S. Department of Labor, 1991) that involves “profit-and-loss or revenue generating responsibilities” (Berry & Franks, 2010, p. 6). If women continue to “occupy managerial roles that serve staff functions, such as human resources and public relations, rather than line functions…their chances for advancement are limited” (Eagly & Carli, 2007, p. 150) as they have no way of obtaining the necessary experience to be promoted.

Lack of access to an organization’s social networks is another barrier to women’s advancement (Bird, 2011; Hunt et al., 2009). Networks are a source of information about opportunities for advancement (Lepkowski, 2009; U.S. Department of Labor, 1991), provide
access to mentors (T. M. Brown, 2005), and are a way to connect with organizational power structures (Hunt et al., 2009). Often described in the literature on gender inequality as the good ol’ boys club (Bagilhole & White, 2008; Ballenger, 2010; Berry & Franks, 2010; Eddy, 2008; Gerdes, 2006; Lafreniere & Longman, 2008; Muñoz, 2010), networks in higher education often exclude women because, in part, men are prone to be more friendly with other men (Bagilhole & White, 2008; Ballenger, 2010; Bird, 2011; Dominici et al., 2009; Kjeldal et al., 2005; White et al., 2010). Male dominated networks are problematic when business decisions are made during activities such as playing golf or watching football where there is no female representation (Ballenger, 2010). Overall, network connections are key to improving one’s social capital (Hunt et al., 2009), “the relationships between people and the feelings of mutual obligation and support that these relationships create” (Eagly & Carli, 2007, p. 144). Social capital has been cited as “more essential to managers’ advancement than skillful performance of traditional managerial tasks” (Eagly & Carli, 2007, p. 144).

Mentors are a type of network connection (Hunt et al., 2009) that has been found to be critical in preparing for senior level administrative positions in higher education (Bagilhole & White, 2008; Ballenger, 2010; Bornstein, 2008; T. M. Brown, 2005; Campbell & LaCost, 2009, 2010b; Drake, 2008; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Eddy, 2008; Glazer-Raymo, 1999; Lepkowski, 2009; Linehan et al., 2009). Mentors provide encouragement to consider upper level positions such as when to seek a presidency (Bornstein, 2008; Eddy, 2008; Gander, 2010; Muñoz, 2010), increase one’s visibility in an organization (Ballenger, 2010), arrange for professional developmental opportunities (U.S. Department of Labor, 1991), and provide letters of support for job applications (Ballenger, 2010; T. M. Brown, 2005; Krull, 2011). Overall, there are less mentoring opportunities in higher education administration for women than men (Linehan et al.,
2009; White et al., 2010). This can be due to women’s exclusion from social networks (Ballenger, 2010; Dominici et al., 2009; Muñoz, 2010), men being “embarrassed to associate with, or unable to relate to” (Linehan et al., 2009, p. 409) women, or a lack of female senior administrators to serve as mentors (Linehan et al., 2009). Organizations should harness the power of mentoring to enhance their pipeline and encourage the establishment of mentoring relationships by promoting them as “opportunity for mutual learning and increased outcomes for both the mentor and protégé” (Hunt et al., 2009, p. 246).

Bird (2011) provides an excellent summary of the role institutional barriers play in impeding women’s advancement in higher education.

The segregation of academic disciplines and institutions, the construction of faculty and administrative roles in ways that are more consistent with men’s lives, and the maintenance of evaluation processes that disproportionately value the disciplines and activities that men dominate are all examples of how university structures and associated cultures and practices are gendered (Bird et al., 2004; Jacobs, 1995; Umbach, 2007). These factors, in turn, influence future university policies and the structuring of jobs, the ways in which faculty members are evaluated, and men’s dominance of powerful decision-making university positions (National Research Council [U.S.], 2006). (Bird, 2011, p. 208)

Few would take the position that these barriers do not exist, so what remains for debate are the best approaches to mitigate their effects until a permanent solution for gender inequality can be found.

**Individual barriers.**
Sometimes referred to as “women-centered explanations” (Bird, 2011, p. 203), this last set of barriers encompasses the aspirations, beliefs, choices, motives, values, and actions as well as demographic characteristics (e.g. marital status, number of children and educational attainment) of women that have been found to limit their opportunities for advancement. This literature review will focus on three—career aspirations, intentionality and work-family conflict.

**Career aspirations.**

Studies have found that women respond to “a system that structurally and culturally privileges men” (Bornstein, 2008, p. 165) by being less motivated to achieve senior level positions including the presidency (Bornstein, 2008; Lepkowski, 2009). When discussing their career aspirations, some will say they are happy with their current position (Eddy, 2008; McTavish & Miller, 2009) or want to stay in academics because they enjoy helping faculty develop (Lepkowski, 2009). Other women will mention an aversion to the activities required of senior administrators such as fundraising (Bornstein, 2008). As a result, women tend to “choose occupations that have short career ladders with limited opportunities for progression” (T. M. Brown, 2005, p. 660).

According to Fels (2004), women experiencing role conflict while attempting to obtain a higher level position will often reduce or abandon their aspirations.

These days, the threat to women's ambitions comes at a later phase of women's lives, when they have families and are advancing to more competitive positions in their work. Women who pursue careers must cope with jobs structured to accommodate the life cycles of men with wives who don't have full-time careers. And they must suffer the social pressure to fulfill more traditional, “feminine” roles. It's a situation that still creates unnecessarily agonizing choices. Too often, when the choice must be made,
women choose to downsize their ambitions or abandon them altogether. (Fels, 2004, p. 60)

Ryan et al. (2009) tie the abandoning of ambitions to the concept of opting out, leaving employment because of gender related challenges including “feelings of being undervalued and a lack of opportunity” (p. 155). For a woman, opting out is often empowering by producing a sense of control (Ryan et al., 2009). It can, however, carry the connotation “of being unable to cope” (Berry & Franks, 2010, p. 4). After opting out, some women find great success as an entrepreneur (Berry & Franks, 2010; Ryan et al., 2009). Between 2007 and 2016, the number of women owned businesses increased 45% to 11.3 million (Womenable, 2016).

**Intentionality.**

Researchers have concluded that career planning, sometimes referred to as intentionality, has a positive impact on advancement including the attainment of senior level positions (Eddy, 2008; Hankinson, 2013; Lepkowski, 2009; LeSavoy & Bergeroni, 2011). It involves being “proactive and strategic” (T. M. Brown, 2005, p. 664) rather than letting one’s career be guided by chance. Intentionality works in close association with career aspirations. Eddy (2008) found that “the lack of intentionality of seeking a presidential position…supports the previous research showing a leveling off of career trajectories” (p. 62). Intentionality is supported by making the decision to play the game (Davis & Maldonado, 2015; Linehan et al., 2009). “Women administrators are ambivalent about the perceived need to play power games to advance.” (Madden, 2005, p. 8) In addition, women need to obtain the right credentials (Lloyd-Jones, 2009) through training (Bornstein, 2008; Lepkowski, 2009) and a variety of “key learning opportunities” (Eddy, 2008, p. 57) such as special projects, job shadowing and internships.

**Work-family conflict.**
A substantial portion of the literature on gender inequality including Hoobler et al. (2009); Eddy and Cox (2008); Campbell and Lacost (2010a); Gander (2010); Ozkanli et al. (2009); Vaccaro (2011); and White et al. (2010) references the challenges women face in balancing of career aspirations with family responsibilities. Women remain the primary caregiver for the family (Bornstein, 2008; Dominici et al., 2009; Gerdes, 2006; Haveman & Beresford, 2012; O'Brien & Janssen, 2005) spending significantly more time on household and child-related activities than men (Easterly & Ricard, 2011; Gerdes, 2006; Hill et al., 2011; Lepkowski, 2009; Thompson-Adams, 2012). Consequently, the long hours required of senior leaders are “difficult to reconcile with family responsibilities” (Eagly & Carli, 2007, p. 140). Women also can have issues with geographic mobility because of family commitments (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Eddy & Cox, 2008; Lepkowski, 2009). Work-family conflict has been found to negatively impact the opportunities offered to women (Bird, 2011; Hill et al., 2011) as well as affect their career choices (Bornstein, 2008; Eddy, 2008) which can include “delaying career moves or opting not to seek new opportunities” (Eddy, 2008, p. 60). All of which results in professional disadvantage for women (Bornstein, 2008; Easterly & Ricard, 2011; Gerdes, 2006; Glazer-Raymo, 1999; Haveman & Beresford, 2012; Lepkowski, 2009; Linehan et al., 2009; McTavish & Miller, 2009; O'Brien & Janssen, 2005).

In order to ascend the career ladder, women often feel that personal sacrifices (Campbell & Lacost, 2010a) such as delaying or forgoing marriage and children (Eagly & Carli, 2007; Haveman & Beresford, 2012) are required. Demographic data for institutions of higher education shows that women with children are less likely to be in tenure track positions (Dominici et al., 2009; Hill et al., 2011), an important first step on the pathway to president. Unfortunately, the timeline for tenure tends to coincide with a woman’s childbearing years.
This pattern is also true in the C-suite where more men than women presidents are married and have children (Bornstein, 2008; Lepkowski, 2009; Linehan et al., 2009).

In their attempts to overcome work-family conflict, women have found it helpful to have “atypical domestic arrangements” (Linehan et al., 2009, p. 407) where a spouse, partner or paid caregiver handles most of the domestic responsibilities (Campbell & Lacost, 2010a; Dominici et al., 2009; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Gerdes, 2006; Linehan et al., 2009). Part-time work can be the solution for some (McTavish & Miller, 2009), but frequently, women selecting this option are “marginalized for their lack of devotion to the firm and cut off from promotion to upper management” (Haveman & Beresford, 2012, p. 123). Women can also ask for accommodations such as flexible work hours or tenure clock. Few women do this, however, out of fear for adverse repercussions (Hill et al., 2011; Hoobler et al., 2009; McTavish & Miller, 2009). The best solution is creating “a more family friendly culture” (Dominici et al., 2009, p. 27) in our organizations.

During everyday conversation, the decisions embedded in individual barriers are often viewed as personal choices that both women—and men—have to make. As demonstrated above, these decisions impact women differently and most often negatively in the workplace especially on advancement opportunities.

Inequality comes in many forms including race, class, age, and gender. While attempting to understand gender inequality in higher education administration, there are no clear divisions between its many manifestations. In fact, the literature reveals symbiotic relationships between them. For example, gender based stereotypes that operate at the cultural level affect both hiring and promotions in organizations, institutional barriers. It is also noteworthy that much of the
literature, especially studies focusing on individual barriers, recommends strategies to cope with the problem of practice rather than eliminate it. Further investigation is therefore necessary to build consensus around root causes, so this inequity can be targeted for eradication at its core.

**Conclusion**

Overall, the literature reviewed for this study reveals an interconnectedness between the many manifestations of gender inequality in higher education administration as well as numerous deep-seated difficulties encountered when trying to change cultural, institutional and individual conditions that produce these barriers. In addition, while researchers agree that gender inequality in higher education administration persists and is a problem of significance for modern society, there is little coherence in the literature on how to best approach its study. S. J. Jones and Palmer (2011), for example, recommend a focus on institutional barriers by stating, “further research needs to be conducted to explore the working environments of these individuals as they continue to be affected by barriers to career advancement and work and life balance issues” (p. 196). Similarly, Eddy and Cox (2008) remind us “of the work remaining to deconstruct gendered organizational structures within community colleges…offering a forum for a dialogue for change and a site for additional research” (p. 78). Other researchers propose studying cultural barriers such as “current norms regarding valued leadership attributes” (Dominici et al., 2009, p. 27) and “specific cultural and religious beliefs and values” (Rashid, 2010, p. 221). Hoobler et al. (2009) and Barreto, Ryan, et al. (2009) represent a third group of researchers that advocate for a better understanding of individual barriers. “Moreover, it is necessary to understand the day-to-day experiences of women in the workplace, their behaviors, their motivations, and their attitudes. Thus, a social psychological perspective appears particularly appropriate for examining this issue.” (Barreto, Ryan, et al., 2009, p. 15)
When studying a phenomenon, most researchers bring to the project “interpretive lenses” (Creswell, 2007, p. 24) that “play a ‘pervasive but subtle’ role in directing the study” (Anfara & Mertz, 2006, p. xxiv). These lenses, often referred to as theories or theoretical frameworks, are “a simplification of the world, but a simplification aimed at clarifying and explaining some aspect of how it works” (Maxwell, 1996, p. 32) and “include grand theories, like symbolic interactionism and ‘middle range concepts such as culture’ (p. 91), as well as ‘preconceptions, biases, values, frames, and rhetorical habits’ (p. 91)” (Anfara & Mertz, 2006, p. xxiv). The empirical studies included in this literature review employ a variety of theoretical frameworks including social justice (Ballenger, 2010); social identity and leader member exchange (Kjeldal et al., 2005); psychodynamic perspective (S. J. Jones & Palmer, 2011); social constructionism and sensemaking (Hankinson, 2013); feminist standpoint theory (LeSavoy & Bergeroni, 2011; Thompson-Adams, 2012; Vaccaro, 2011); Black feminist theory and critical race theory (Lloyd-Jones, 2009); exchange theory (T. M. Brown, 2005); social role (Hoobler et al., 2009); social closure (Jackson & Leon, 2010); human capital (Haveman & Beresford, 2012; Singell & Tang, 2013; VanDerLinden, 2004); feminist, black feminist, socio-cultural and intersectionality (Davis & Maldonado, 2015); and critical theory (Muñoz, 2010). While not explicitly identified as a theoretical framework, Duberley and Cohen (2010) utilize the work of Pierre Bourdieu, specifically his “concepts of field, habitus and capital” (p. 189), as part of their study examining the career capital of women scientists in academia. Another study by Kettle (1996) cites Bourdieu while explaining the role of cultural capital in gaining legitimacy. Both of these studies were conducted outside the United States in English universities. Consequently, a gap in the research exists since Pierre Bourdieu’s social theory has only been utilized minimally to
study gender inequality in the higher education context and has never been applied in research focusing on female administrators in American institutions of higher education.

Heeding the call for further research and capitalizing on a gap in the literature, this study extends the body of knowledge on gender inequality in higher education administration by further exploring the barriers women face in their pursuit of leadership positions. These barriers, embedded in the essence of the phenomenon, were uncovered by utilizing a novel theoretical framework, the social theory of Pierre Bourdieu. Bourdieu’s work was selected over critical theorists such as Henry Giroux because of his contribution to the understanding of social reproduction, the duplication “of the social relationships and attitudes needed to sustain the existing dominant economic and class relations of the larger society” (McLaren, 2008, p. 89), through his concepts of field, habitus, and capital. Additionally, the study captured the lived experiences of the participants with gender inequality in higher education administration making their voices heard and shedding light on how this problem of practice impacted their lives.
Chapter Three: Methodology

Utilizing the research question, “What are the lived experiences of women who pursued an academic deanship at Research Doctoral institutions with gender inequality?”, this phenomenological study further explored an enduring problem of practice, gender inequality in higher education administration. After explaining the study’s research approach, this chapter outlines the methods that were employed in conducting the investigation as well as ethical considerations, validation strategies and limitations of the study.

Research Design

When planning an empirical study, the researcher must decide between a quantitative, qualitative or mixed methods approach. This decision is supported by the researcher’s philosophical worldview or epistemology (Creswell, 2014). An epistemology is “a certain understanding of what is entailed in knowing, that is, how we know what we know” (Crotty, 1998, p. 8). In this study, the researcher employed constructionism, “the view that all knowledge, and therefore all meaningful reality as such, is contingent upon human practices, being constructed in and out of interaction between human beings and their world, and developed and transmitted within an essentially social context” (Crotty, 1998, p. 42). As a result, a qualitative approach was selected. Qualitative research focuses on “exploring or understanding the meaning individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem” (Creswell, 2014, p. 4).

Research Tradition

According to Crotty (1998), a methodology is “the strategy, plan of action, process or design lying behind the choice and use of particular methods and linking the choice and use of methods to the desired outcomes” (p. 3). There are a number of validated methodologies that
can be used for qualitative research including case studies, ethnography, grounded theory, hermeneutics, heuristics, narrative research, and phenomenology (Creswell, 2007; Moustakas, 1994).

Phenomenology was ultimately chosen because the researcher “is not studying the individual but is studying how a particular phenomenon manifests and appears in the lifeworld” (Vagle, 2014, p. 23). Consequently, the participants’ role is to provide “access to all sorts of important manifestations and appearances of the phenomenon” (Vagle, 2014, p. 23). This methodology strives to “explicate the phenomenon in terms of its constituents and possible meanings, thus discerning the features of consciousness and arriving at an understanding of the essences [emphasis added] of the experience” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 49).

Although “important precursors of phenomenology can be found in the work of Immanuel Kant, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, and Ernst Mach” (Moran, 2002, p. 1), it was Edmund Husserl’s work in the early 1900s that established phenomenology as a philosophical discipline (Lichtman, 2012; Moran, 2002; Smith, 2013). His writings are the basis for what is known today as transcendental phenomenology (Moustakas, 1994). Other phenomenological movements include existential—key authors: Martin Heidegger, Jean Paul Sartre, Simone de Beauvoir, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, and Gabriel Marcel; hermeneutical—key authors: Martin Heidegger, Hans-Georg Gadamer and Paul Ricoeur; linguistical—key authors: Maurice Blanchot, Jacques Derrida and Michel Paul Foucault; ethical—key authors: Max Scheler and Emmanuel Levinas; and phenomenology of practice, also known as experiential or applied phenomenology (van Manen, 2011). For this study, transcendental phenomenology as outlined by author Clark Moustakas was utilized.
The theoretical framework selected for this study, the social theory of Pierre Bourdieu, aligns well with phenomenological inquiry. Bourdieu studied philosophy at the École Normale Supérieure in Paris and obtained his teaching certification in philosophy before becoming a practicing sociologist. As a result, his theory draws upon the work of Husserl, Heidegger, and Merleau-Ponty among others (Sapiro, 2015a). Moran (2011), Throop and Murphy (2002) and Sapiro (2015b), for example, cite Husserl’s influence on Bourdieu’s concept of habitus. While Bourdieu writings were often critical of phenomenology, “in a 2001 reply to critics, Bourdieu claims that his ‘aim [is] to integrate phenomenological analysis into a global approach of which it is one phase (the first, subjective phase), the second being the objectivist analysis’” (Moran, 2011, p. 54). Overall, phenomenology’s influence on Pierre Bourdieu’s social theory is undeniable.

Participants

When conducting a phenomenological study, the most important criteria for selecting participants is that they have experience with the phenomenon and are “intensely interested in understanding its nature and meanings” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 107). Other criteria “include: age, race, religion, ethnic and cultural factors, gender, and political and economic factors” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 107) and are related to the context in which the researcher wants to examine the phenomenon (e.g. by a particular social group, in a particular location, at a particular time, et cetera). This method for selecting participants is known as criterion, or purposeful, sampling. It is “a strategy in which particular settings, persons, or events are selected deliberately in order to provide important information that can’t be gotten as well from other choices” (Maxwell, 1996, p. 70). The criteria established for this study are:

- is of the female gender;
• currently employed by a Research Doctoral institution as defined by the Carnegie Classification™;
• has never served as an academic dean or higher at a Research Doctoral institution; and
• experienced within the past 10 years what she believes to be the glass ceiling while pursuing a promotion to academic dean at a Research Doctoral institution and was unsuccessful in obtaining the position.

There is considerable discussion among practitioners over the number of participants required for a phenomenological study. van Manen (2014) suggests that “the general aim should be to gather enough experientially rich accounts that make possible the figuration of powerful experiential examples or anecdotes that help to make contact with life as it is lived” (p. 353). Interpreting the work of Amedeo Giorgi, Englander (2012) recommends at least three participants. Kvale (2007) advises interviewing “as many subjects as necessary to find out what you need to know” (p. 43) but states that most studies employing interviews typically have between five and 25 participants. Additionally, Vagle (2014) guides researchers to “practice openness” (p. 75) and embrace the emergent nature of phenomenological inquiry. As a result, the study began with a goal of six participants and the option to add additional participants if necessary to obtain “the right amount of experiential material…that creates a scholarly and reflective phenomenological text” (van Manen, 2014, p. 353).

**Recruitment and Access**

A multi-pronged approach was taken to recruit participants for this study. First, the human resources department at Research Doctoral institutions such as Duquesne University, University of Pittsburgh, Robert Morris University, Indiana University of Pennsylvania, and Carnegie Mellon University was asked to distribute a call to participate (Appendix A) to their
female faculty members and academic administrators. Next, the state chairs of American Council on Education Women’s Network and state branches of American Association of University Women were asked to distribute a call to participate (Appendix A) to their members. Additionally, the researcher asked friends, family and colleagues to distribute a call to participate (Appendix A) to females they know working in higher education administration. Interested parties were asked to contact the researcher via e-mail. The researcher followed-up with each potential participant by telephone to answer questions about the study and obtain preliminary information about the individual’s experience with the phenomenon. The individuals who best met the criteria established for this study were selected to participate.

Participants were able to withdraw from the study at any time (Moustakas, 1994) by either calling or e-mailing the researcher. Any data collected from a participant that withdrew was to be immediately destroyed, and the participant replaced by an alternate.

No incentives were utilized to entice participation in this study.

**Protection of human subjects.**

Qualitative researchers face a variety of ethical issues when conducting a study. First and foremost, it is essential that the researcher be honest with participants about the “nature, purpose, and requirements of the research project” (Moustakas, 1994, pp. 109-110). The researcher in this study had two opportunities—the call to participate (Appendix A) and introductory phone call—to address these issues before the participant was asked to provide informed consent. An unsigned informed consent form (Appendix B) was utilized.

Next, the researcher established and maintained a professional distance with participants by minimizing what she shared about herself and her experiences with the phenomenon.
To probe, the interviewer cannot be stonily impersonal; he or she has to give something of himself or herself in order to merit an open response. Yet the conversation lists in one direction; the point is not to talk the way friends do. (Kvale, 2007, p. 9)

Otherwise, the potential to introduce both researcher and response bias (Kvale, 1994) into the data collection process increases.

Finally, when conducting research involving human participants, it is necessary to protect them “from exploitation or exposure to unacceptable levels of risk” (Herr & Anderson, 2005, p. 113). Consequently, this research followed Northeastern University’s (2013) policy applying “the protections of the federal regulations (45 CFR 46) to all of our human subject research regardless of its source of support, or lack thereof” (Northeastern University, 2013, para. 2). While the researcher anticipated no “physical, psychological, legal, social, and economic risks” (Butin, 2010, p. 104) for participants, anonymity (Herr & Anderson, 2005; Moustakas, 1994) was maintained throughout the study by creating “pseudonyms for the individuals interviewed” (Butin, 2010, p. 106).

This study’s procedures related to the protection of human subjects were reviewed and approved by Northeastern University’s Institutional Review Board. A copy of the approval is attached as Appendix C, Notice of IRB Action.

Data Collection

In phenomenological research, data is gathered primarily from “first-person reports of life experiences” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 84). Moustakas (1994) recommends the phenomenological interview with “open-ended comments and questions” (p. 114) that allow the participant “to focus on the experience, moments of particular awareness and impact, and then to describe the experience fully” (p. 114). Others including van Manen (2014) and Vagle (2014) state that
observations, written descriptions, paintings, poetry, novels, and films can also be sources of data. This study followed Moustakas’ (1994) recommendation and utilized interviews as its primary data gathering method.

A phenomenological interview most often employs an unstructured interview technique, since “in many phenomenological studies it is not necessary, nor even desirable to ask the same questions in the same way. The goal is to find out as much as you can about the phenomenon from each particular participant” (Vagle, 2014, p. 79). If a participant does not provide “sufficient meaning and depth” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 116) during their interview, a selection of pre-prepared, broad, open-ended questions can “facilitate the obtaining of rich, vital, substantive descriptions of the…experience of the phenomenon” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 116). Should this situation occur, a brief interview guide (Appendix D) including introductory, direct and indirect questions (Kvale, 2007) was created.

The researcher conducted interviews using a video conferencing application due to the geographic distance between researcher and interviewee. All interviews were recorded in the application as MP4 files then transcribed for later analysis. One 60-minute interview was conducted per participant. Follow-up questions were submitted to the participants via e-mail.

**Data Storage**

Printed materials such as field notes are stored in a filing cabinet the researcher’s home office. All electronic files including analytic memos, audio recordings and transcripts of interviews are kept on the researcher’s password protected laptop computer. A digital, back-up copy of all data gathered is saved on the researcher’s external hard drive. Only the researcher has access to her home office, laptop computer and external hard drive.
A transcriptionist had access to the audio recordings. A password protected Dropbox account was used to transmit data to and receive data from the transcriptionist.

Most data will be destroyed approximately ninety days after the doctoral thesis has been successfully defended and the study’s findings have been published in at least one academic journal. Transcripts of each interview with the verbal consent will be kept in a filing cabinet the researcher’s home office for the required three-year period.

Data Analysis

**Epoche: The role of the researcher.**

Phenomenologists “contemplate and theorize the various ways things manifest and appear in and through our being in the world…the world as it is lived, not the world as it measured, transformed, represented, correlated, categorized, compared, and broken down” (Vagle, 2014, p. 22). This method of knowledge requires that we set aside our prejudgments, biases, and preconceived ideas about things. We “invalidate,” “inhibit,” and “disqualify” all commitments with reference to previous knowledge and experience (Schmitt, 1968, p. 59). The world is placed out of action, while remaining bracketed. However, the world in the bracket has been cleared of ordinary thought and is presented before us as a phenomenon to be gazed upon, to be known naively and freshly through a “purified” consciousness. (Moustakas, 1994, p. 85)

Created by Husserl and named Epoche, the Greek word for abstention, (Moustakas, 1994; Vagle, 2014; van Manen, 2014), this process was used throughout the study by the researcher. “Practiced wisely, realistically, and with determination…the actual nature and essence of things will be disclosed more fully, will reveal themselves to us and enable us to find a clearing and light to knowledge and truth.” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 90)
**Reduction.**

Phenomenologists perform reduction on data gathered to develop textual descriptions of the phenomenon (Moustakas, 1994; Vagle, 2014; van Manen, 2014). Textural descriptions represent what participants experienced with the phenomenon. This study adhered to Moustakas’ (1994) method for reduction comprised of four sequential steps: (1) bracketing; (2) horizons; (3) clustering the horizons into themes; and (4) organizing the horizons and themes into a coherent textural description. He summarizes the steps by stating,

*Bracketing*, in which the focus of the research is placed in brackets, everything else is set aside [through the researcher practicing Epocha] so that the entire research process is rooted solely on the topic and question; *horizontalizing*, every statement initially is treated as having equal value. Later, statements irrelevant to the topic and question as well as those that are repetitive or overlapping are deleted, leaving only the *Horizons* (the textural meanings and invariant constituents of the phenomenon); *Clustering the Horizons Into Themes*; and *Organizing the Horizons and Themes Into a Coherent Textural Description* of the phenomenon. (Moustakas, 1994, p. 97)

The goal of reduction is to describe “just what one sees, not only in terms of the external object but also the internal act of consciousness, the experience as such, the rhythm and relationship between phenomenon and self. The qualities of the experience become the focus” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 90). This process is conducted for each participant, then the individual textural descriptions are integrated into a composite textural description for the group.

**Using coding to facilitate reduction.**

Steps two and three of the reduction process were be aided by three coding methods, *in vivo*, *themeing* the data and focused coding (Saldaña, 2009). In a first review of the data, words
and short phrases “from the actual language found in the qualitative data” (Saldaña, 2009, p. 74) were highlighted creating in vivo codes. “Their salience may be attributed to such features as impacting nouns, action-oriented verbs, evocative word choices, clever or ironic phrases, similes and metaphors, etc.” (Saldaña, 2009, p. 75) The in vivo codes represent horizons as defined by Moustakas (1994). Axial coding was then used to organize the in vivo codes into categories, or themes. “This method ‘relates categories to subcategories [and] specifies the properties and dimensions of a category’ (Charmaz, 2006, p. 60).” (Saldaña, 2009, p. 159)

Next, the data was reread and sections tagged “with an extended thematic statement” (Saldaña, 2009, p. 139). Themes in this context are

* a phrase or sentence that identifies what a unit of data is about and/or what it means.

Boyatzis (1998) explains that a theme “at a minimum describes and organizes possible observations or at the maximum interprets aspects of the phenomenon. A theme may be identified at the manifest level (directly observable in the information) or at the latent level (underlying the phenomenon)” (p. vii). (Saldaña, 2009, p. 139)

The researcher will not predetermine themes for which to look but rather let them “emerge from the data” (Saldaña, 2009, p. 140).

To conclude the reduction process, the themes produced through axial coding and themeing the data were merged to create textural description of the phenomenon. “In the process of explicating the phenomenon, qualities are recognized and described; every perception is granted equal value, nonrepetitive constituents of the experience are linked thematically, and a full description is derived.” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 96)

**Imaginative variation.**
Next, imaginative variation was used “to arrive at structural descriptions of an experience, the underlying and precipitating factors that account for what is being experienced; in other words the ‘how’ that speaks to conditions that illuminate the ‘what’ of experience” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 98). This process includes “systematic varying of the possible structural meanings…recognizing the underlying themes or contexts that account for the emergence of the phenomenon…considering the universal structures that precipitate feelings and thoughts with reference to the phenomenon” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 99) and searching for examples that aid in developing structural descriptions. Bourdieu’s social theory assisted this phase of data analysis, particularly with recognizing the conditions necessary for the phenomenon to appear. “Through imaginative Variation the researcher understands that there is not a single inroad to truth, but that countless possibilities emerge that are intimately connected with the essences and meanings of an experience.” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 99) Like reduction, this process is first completed for each participant, then the individual structural descriptions are combined into a composite structural description for the group.

**Textural-structural synthesis.**

In the final phase of data analysis, the composite textural and structural descriptions were integrated into “a unified statement of the essences of the experience of the phenomenon as a whole” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 100). Essence, in this context, “means that which is common or universal, the condition or quality without which a thing would not be what it is” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 100). This statement is “a universal description of the experience representing the group as a whole” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 122).

**The role of CAQDAS software.**
A computer assisted qualitative data analysis software, or CAQDAS (Saldaña, 2009; Yin, 2011), package was utilized throughout the process for data management. NVivo 11 Pro from QSR International was selected by the researcher. By automating tasks such as maintaining the code list and linking memos, the researcher was freed to “to focus on the data and their reactions to it” (Talanquer, 2015, p. 84). While CAQDAS packages are extremely helpful in qualitative research, the researcher must still conduct “all of the analytic thinking” (Yin, 2011, p. 180).

**Trustworthiness**

Many of the validation strategies used by qualitative researchers such as discrepant evidence and negative cases; quasi-statistics; comparison; and triangulation (Maxwell, 1996; Yin, 2011) are not applicable to phenomenological studies. van Manen (2014) advises that “a common problem for phenomenological researchers is to be challenged in defending their research in terms of references that do not belong to the methodology of phenomenology” (p. 347). As a solution, he suggests that phenomenological inquiries “be assessed on the criteria of its suspension of personal or systematic bias, its originality of insight, and its scholarly treatment of sources” (van Manen, 2014, p. 347).

Member checks that take the form of asking participants “whether the examples or anecdotes derived from these experiential materials are resonant with their original experiences” (van Manen, 2014, p. 348) or to examine the textural-structural synthesis to see if changes need to be made (Moustakas, 1994) is methodologically acceptable as a tool for establishing trustworthiness in a phenomenological study’s findings. This strategy “does not validate the quality of the phenomenological study as a whole” (van Manen, 2014, p. 348), however, only the information reviewed. For this study, the researcher shared with participants their participant profile found in Chapter Four that represents the textural-structural synthesis developed from
their data. They were asked to make corrections or additions in order to ensure that it accurately
reflected their experiences with the phenomenon. The only changes that were requested were
related to preserving participant anonymity.

Another strategy the researcher employed to build credibility in the study’s findings is
analytic memos. Shenton (2004) refers to this as writing a “reflective commentary…to record
the researcher’s initial impressions of each data collection session, patterns appearing to emerge
in the data collected and theories generated” (p. 68). Memos can also be used to record codes,
“comment on their own involvement in the research settings or their feelings about the setting”
(S. J. Taylor, Bogdan, & DeVault, 2016, p. 172). In a phenomenological study, the use of
analytic memos can also assist with the Epoche process. Moustakas (1994) encourages writing
out our prejudgments and reviewing “the list until its hold on my consciousness is released” (p.
89).

The final strategy the researcher used to build credibility is peer debriefing. During the
debriefing session, a peer of the researcher will “play the devil’s advocate. The inquirer’s biases
are probed, meanings explored, the basis for interpretations clarified” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p.
308). This session was held during the data analysis phase of this study.

A key threat to the internal validity of this study is ‘‘response effect bias,’ where people
will tell interviewers what they want to hear. This is not to suggest that people lie; it is simply
that we modify our answers to be more socially acceptable and in general mute perspectives that
are not culturally sanctioned” (Butin, 2010, p. 97). Therefore, it was essential that the researcher
develop rapport with the participants early in the data collection phase so that they felt
comfortable being honest about their experiences and provided rich, thick data for analysis.

Limitations of the Study
Generally, qualitative research is not concerned with the issue of external validity, or generalizability.

By its very nature, qualitative research is particularistic. Understanding the nuances and patterns of social behavior only results from studying specific situations and people, complemented by attending carefully to specific contextual conditions. The particularistic feature makes it difficult to consider how the findings from qualitative studies can be generalized to some broader set of conditions—beyond those in the immediate study. (Yin, 2011, p. 98)

This is especially true of the phenomenological methodology. van Manen (2014) advises researchers that “the only generalization allowed in phenomenological inquiry is ‘never generalize’” (p. 352).
Chapter Four: Research Findings

This phenomenological study renewed the examination of gender inequality in higher education administration by exploring the lived experiences of women who pursued an academic deanship at Research Doctoral institutions, as defined by the Carnegie Classification™, and were unsuccessful in obtaining the positions due to what they believe to be the glass ceiling phenomenon.

Forty women responded to the call to participate (Appendix A) that was distributed nationwide, but only five were identified by the researcher as meeting the study’s selection criteria. Unstructured interviews were conducted with four of the five women. The fifth did not logon for her scheduled interview nor did she respond to requests to reschedule. While the study began with a goal of six participants, the researcher decided to move forward into data analysis with only four participants, because “one must be willing to make a data-gathering and analysis plan and then, once carrying out that plan, be willing to make adjustments and explore new ways to open up the phenomenon” (Vagle, 2014, p. 77).

The participants in this study are all of the female gender with between 14 and 31 years work experience in higher education. Three are Caucasian. One is African-American. Currently, they all hold faculty appointments as well as serving in an administrative capacity such as department chair, president of the faculty council or program director. Two completed an interim appointment to dean within the past five years. None have served as dean on a permanent basis. All four are employed by institutions located in the Eastern half of the United States. Two are considered urban campuses. One is suburban. The last is rural.

This chapter begins by presenting a profile of each participant that includes both textural and structural descriptions of their experience with the phenomenon. Next, following the same
structure as the literature review, themes that emerged from the data are presented according to the factors that contributed to their creation. The chapter concludes with the textural-structural synthesis of the phenomenon which “represents the essences at a particular time and place from the vantage point of an individual researcher following an exhaustive imaginative and reflective study of the phenomenon” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 100).

**Participant Profiles**

**Amanda.**

Amanda’s lengthy career in higher education began in 1986 as a reference librarian and instructor. She obtained her Ph.D. in library and information studies in 1995. Between 1996 and 2004, she served in a variety of administrative roles at a small college including director of graduate studies, director of institutional research and library director while rising through the faculty ranks to associate professor. Amanda came to her current institution, an urban R2—doctoral university with higher research activity, in 2004 as an assistant professor. This semi-autonomous university is part of a larger public university system. She was promoted to associate professor in 2010. In 2012, Amanda was appointed interim campus-level dean for the School of Library and Information Science. A year later, her school was merged into the School of Computing, and she became chair of the Department of Library and Information Science.

Up until this point in her career, Amanda did not feel she had experienced gender inequality of note. When the merger occurred, an internal search commenced for a permanent campus-level dean for the School of Computing that reports to the university system’s dean of computing. The interim campus-level dean position was held by a male who had previously served the school as associate dean of research. Only two people applied for the job, Amanda and the interim campus-level dean who received the appointment. The system dean “talked to
me later about why he chose the other person for this position, and he said, essentially, “The school needs a strong leader right now, and that’s why I’m choosing this other guy.”” Over the years, Amanda developed a collaborative leadership style, and she believes that this clashes with the School of Computing’s “very narrow conception of what a leader was. A leader [for them] is somebody who is top down, who has the answer and who will tell you what to do.” Amanda is also

in a profession, librarianship, where sometimes we are—it is a more feminine style of going about things. We are very helpful. We believe that it’s not demeaning to be helpful, but other people may think that if your helpful you are in a subordinate position.

Servant leadership is something that we really think is good.

Ultimately, “the strengths of the guy they chose were accurate. I don’t dispute that. But, they had no clue as to the strengths they were not seeing, because they had a very narrow definition of what they were looking for.”

Later, Amanda expressed interest in the school’s associate dean for academic affairs position. A male colleague was also interested in the job.

What still irritates me today is that this [campus-level] dean saw the strengths of the alternative, the guy, and figured he could pick up the other stuff. But, he told me that I didn’t know enough about these other things. He never was open to the possibility that I could actually learn something. The guy could learn something, but I couldn’t. For that particular position, the associate dean for academic affairs—I am not incorrect—I was more qualified than he was….I do accreditation work. I’ve done a lot of stuff….I mean nobody going into any job knows everything, so you are going to have to have learning
there. He assumed the learning would happen with the guy that he chose. He apparently did not assume that the learning would go on with me.

Currently, she is a faculty member in the Department of Library and Information Science and president of the campus-wide faculty council.

These experiences have left Amanda feeling “frustrated” in an atmosphere that she characterizes as “gender-negative.”

At this point in my life, I just wish for the sake of others and myself that they would widen up their blinders to see and value things other than—I don’t dispute them valuing what they value, but they’re not valuing all the stuff that they are not seeing. There are different ways of managing. I’m not trying to force anybody into any one, but I want them to realize that there are different ways of managing. Many of these are very gender related. If I told them—well I have said very bluntly to a few places—that this is the most—my school [School of Computing] currently is the most gender discriminatory place I have seen in thirty years of working in academia. It’s like everybody who’s invisible to them happens to be a woman, and everyone who is visible to them happens to be a man.

Currently, she is looking outside the school for opportunities.

I think that I would be good at academic administration, but I have no hope of doing it within my school. Fortunately, we are in a big enough system that there may be opportunities elsewhere. If worse comes to worse, I really do love my department, so that’s fine.

A glass ceiling emerged for Amanda after library and information science became part of the School of Computing. Her department was now part of a school with a masculinized culture,
preference for male models of leadership, inability to appreciate diversity, and desire to maintain the status quo.

They see themselves in mirrors, and they don’t really look outside that. So, I said it was the boy geeks, and they’re in their own little echo chamber. Then, we came in. We were just stuck in there, and we present something very different which they are handling mostly by ignoring us.

It is not uncommon for the disciplines of computer science and library science to be housed in the same school. This merger, however, did not go smoothly. “We went through a hell of a lot of insults about libraries are dead. Why are you in that field?” Comments like these are one example of the small, more subtle biases that support the glass ceiling. Another is dismissing women’s opinions. “The [male] associate dean for faculty affairs came and pretty much took over the entire meeting. I mean we couldn’t say anything without him contradicting it.” Leaders in other areas of the institution are more supportive of women.

In the larger schools [on this campus], the leaders have a more professional approach to leadership: they are more conscious of ‘the right way’ to do things. They also inherently have more diversity because of the variety of academic disciplines which are included. Thus, they encounter and must respect intellectual diversity, which prepares them for handling gender and other diversities with respect.

Eventually, the culture in the School of Computing will change due to faculty turnover, but it’s doubtful that this will occur soon enough to have any impact on Amanda’s career as she only anticipates working another eight years.

Heidi.
Heidi began her career in secondary education where she was employed as a Spanish teacher for five years. In 2001, she transitioned into higher education working as a student affairs administrator while pursuing her Ph.D. Upon receiving her doctorate in 2005, Heidi left student affairs and accepted a faculty appointment as assistant professor of higher education. In 2007, she came to her current institution, a rural R2—doctoral university with higher research activity, as an associate professor.

In 2014, when Heidi applied for her first position in academic administration, associate dean for the College of Education and Human Development, she didn’t do it really with a lot of interest. It was one of those things where I had gotten a lot of pressure from peers in the college. More along the lines of if you don’t do it, then Dr. Blah Blah Blah will do it.

She received the appointment. Suddenly, four months later, the dean to whom she reported left the university. The day to day details of running the college fell to Heidi until an interim dean was selected. Because her colleagues felt like she was doing a good job, they suggested that she apply for this position. Heidi was selected to be interim dean and began the job in June 2015.

The longer I was doing it, the more changes I was seeing and the more impact I felt like I could help make, the more I thought, “You know what. I really like this. I have an affinity for this.” I was getting a lot of positive feedback. Not to say that everything was universally rainbow and unicorns, but I’d say, overall, I was getting a lot of really positive feedback from everyone at the college and even stakeholders outside of it. When the permanent search was launched, I definitely applied and went through that process.

It was during this search that Heidi realized she had hit a glass ceiling at her institution.
There were two finalists interviewed for the position, Heidi and an external, male candidate. He was not well received on campus, and Heidi was told by members of the search committee that she “was the clear selection.” “I kept hearing the phrase slam dunk, slam dunk. So, it did seem like this is just going to happen.” About three weeks later, the provost informed Heidi that he did not select her for the position.

The only feedback I got from him at that point was he [the external, male candidate] has more experience. And I said, “Of course he has more experience. He’s older than I am. He better have more experience.” But, it was really nothing of substance. It just felt very empty to me. It’s hard for me to know how much of it was gender and how much of it was age. I think there were both. I am younger, but at the same time, I had a very proven track record of success within that college.

Multiple people came to Heidi expressing dismay over the provost’s decision.

There was so much public outcry about what had happened—to the point where I was asked to go in to see the vice president of human resources. They were wondering if I was going to sue. I considered it. There are still days where I think, “Should I’ve done it?” I think I could have had a case.

After some time passed, Heidi pressed the provost for more information about why she did not receive the position. His answer what that she needed experience as a department chair.

Even though I was the one who ran department chair training on campus for three years. I was the one who helped set up the departments in the college. We didn’t have departments before I was there. So, that’s what he came back saying to me was that this guy had more experience with departments. Sure, but he didn’t have more experience with setting up departments. He never had that experience. I had that experience. He
doesn’t have experience trying to help departments understand what it means to be a department, but I have that experience. So, it was one of those things where it felt a little flat to me. I didn’t really see the rationale making a whole lot of sense.

Currently, Heidi is a full professor. In July 2017, she was appointed director of women’s, gender, and sexuality studies as well as a university’s center dedicated to advancing gender equality for women faculty across the institution. “I’m moving into that new position somewhat reluctantly. It’s weird because it’s a step down. I went from being a dean to a department chair.” “I’m still not completely happy with the situation. In some ways, I think it would have been better if I just left, but circumstances being what they are and family situation being what it is, I’m here.”

Despite this experience, Heidi’s career goals remain the same. “I know when—I don’t think it’s if—when I move up, my aspirations are to be a college president or university president.” She has resolved herself, however, that it will not be at her current institution. “The longer time passes, the more I realize that if I stay here, yes, I probably am limited. At least for the time being, while he’s [the provost] in power.”

Heidi’s institution has expended considerable resources trying to advance gender equity but a masculinized culture remains. Homosocial reproduction, a process embedded in culture, influenced who was hired for the position.

People tend to choose people who look like them, or people tend to choose people who’ve had the same experiences or backgrounds because they feel comfortable with that. It’s not because they consciously go, “I only want to pick people who are like me.” It becomes again this implicit bias. I have to wonder with him—it is that. He had a very
linear experience. He went from faculty member to department chair to dean to provost.

If you somehow skipped one of those steps…

Department chair experience was not listed as job requirement, but it was cited as the reason Heidi did not receive the position.

Despite being trained in a discipline that promotes self-awareness, gender-based stereotypes influence the provost’s behavior when conducting searches.

It was interesting because one of the people who went to go see him after my search last year—to kind of call him on the carpet a bit—said to him, “You do recognize that every time there’s been a national search only the man is hired? You do recognize what that looks like?” He said, “Oh, yeah?” He never thought about that. It’s just one of those things where I don’t know if it’s purposeful. It might just be implicit bias.

Across the institution, they also affect expectations about leaders.

The women leaders who I have met and who seem successful are the ones who have this kind of veneer around them. You don’t really see who they are. You don’t really know who they are. Maybe that’s what it takes. I don’t know. I guess for me—I don’t think I am willing to do that. It’s not who I am, and that’s not who I want to be. But, it does make me wonder if that’s what needed.

Embedded in this veneer are masculine characteristics that create a double bind for women.

“All people make these comments about her [the only female dean on campus]. ‘Ahh, I wouldn’t mess with her.’ ‘Oh, she’s kind of scary.’ That she is very brusque.” As a result, women have to ask themselves a difficult decision before adopting a veneer. Does it make me “lesser”?

In the end, people need to understand that diversity is “not a zero-sum game. It’s not that giving somebody else a piece of pie means less pie for you. It doesn’t mean that.” Cultural
change is very slow. “We have to keep working, and we have to keep pushing. It might look very different that it did twenty, thirty, forty years ago, but it’s still there.”

Monique.

Monique started her career in secondary education as an English teacher. After receiving her Ph.D. in 2003, she transitioned into higher education by joining the faculty of a school of education as assistant professor. Monique came to her current institution, a suburban R3—doctoral university with moderate research activity, as assistant professor in 2007. Currently, she is an associate professor of education and director of her institution’s Ed.D. program in executive leadership.

When Monique assumed leadership of the executive leadership program that generates significant revenue for the institution,

the president and members of senior staff were nervous about the Black girl running the program. This is their high-profile program. It’s executive leadership which typically refers to men, so to speak. Who was this girl running this program that brings in all this money?

Monique is “one of three tenured, Black women on the entire campus,” and the institution’s senior staff was predominately White males.

There was only one woman on senior staff at the time. She was the CFO, but, for all intents and purposes, serving in that role, it masculated her in some ways. She had to morph into being “one of the boys.”

Over the years, Monique experienced numerous slights due to her race and gender. “I feel like I get put out on the stage when they need to have a Black face out there, but in many situations, they do stuff, and I’m not included.” However, it was not until 2014 when a conflict occurred
over establishing an additional off-site location for her program that she realized the true intensity of inequality at her institution.

One of Monique’s direct reports convinced her dean, senior staff and the president to open this new location despite her ample evidence against the decision.

The gentleman that reported to me—they literally gave him control of the other locations. All of this is outside the realms of the faculty statute. So, it was kind of like they set up a whole shadow organization. Me, as the Black girl, I’m still supposed to go along and sign all of these financial documents, because I’m the department chair….It was a total setup, and I got to the point where I told the dean, “I’m not signing shit!”

When problems arose at the new location, the dean came to Monique for help.

It’s interesting how they coordinated to work around me. Ultimately, it had to come back to me where I’m expected to put the mammy garb on and the mammy rag on and clean up these people’s shit. It still stings. That was probably about three years ago. I don’t think any level of apology could ever take away the sting of that. I’m at the point now where I tell my assistant all the time, “I just work here.”

Because of this experience, Monique feels she has “plateaued and reached that glass ceiling.”

Monique is adamant that she will not apply for a dean’s position at her institution. “I just think that sometimes you can outgrow your institution, and I’m at a point where I feel like I’m dying on the vine.” In addition to exploring outside opportunities, she has “begun to reassess if academia is for me.” If she does remain in higher education, she would like to become a provost “where I have the larger institutional view.”
Until the 1970s, Monique’s institution, a Catholic heritage school, was all male and “in some ways, we still have that mentality.” The masculinized culture permeates all aspects of institutional operations including hiring and promotion.

On my campus, the message if you don’t play golf or you don’t drink bourbon or if you’re not playing pool in the basement of the president’s house... It’s very clear those lines of delineation—who’s in the in group and who’s in the out group.

Membership in the “ol’ boys network” is perceived to be more important that qualifications.

Black women on the campus have more difficulty ascending the ladder than White women, especially White women who are members of the dominate ethnic group.

The female dean that maneuvers is very, very proud of her Irish ethnicity and wears it very proudly. You know her ethnicity. That fits with the institution. You look at me—that’s just not going to fit for me. As I said, there are certain times when I get kind of rolled out when they need to have a Black face, but there are other times when I don’t get invited to the table.

For Monique, “White women still are in positions of power.” She views the glass ceiling that emerged through a lens created by her intersecting racial and gender identities.

Overall, the institution has done very little to combat inequality. “Accountability structures are vague. [There are] no structures or policies to ensure racial and gender equity in faculty hires.” Change is not anticipated any time soon, so opportunities for women will continue to be limited at this institution.

Lucy.

Lucy has devoted her entire career to higher education. In the 1990s, after obtaining her Ph.D. in the humanities, she accepted an appointment as assistant professor at her current
institution, an urban R2—doctoral university with higher research activity. Over the next 15 years, Lucy rose through the faculty ranks becoming a full professor and department chair.

When I came to this institution, I did not plan to become an administrator. I graduated from a top twenty Ph.D. program. I planned to be a researcher and a teacher. The last thing I ever thought I would do is be administration.

Up until this point, her experiences with gender inequality were “very minor,” but things began to “happen, and it felt very much like it was gender based.” This included Lucy’s authority being questioned much more than her male predecessor’s. “Whatever I was doing was interpreted as aggressive. If a man had done it, it would be interpreted as just normal.” Additionally, she was bullied by a male colleague. “I think he wouldn’t have bullied a male chair.” Lucy had served as in this capacity for approximately five years when she was selected to lead the institution’s honors college.

During the last several years, Lucy has tried twice unsuccessfully to have her position upgraded to dean. She feels she has earned the title based upon her achievements leading the college.

I have done everything I was supposed to do in that self-study done the year before I was hired to lead honors. I’ve grown department and college honors. The numbers of students in department and college honors seats has grown tremendously in five years. I could go on and on and on with the statistics.

There is precedent within her institution. Her predecessor, a male, held the title of associate dean.
Lucy has resolved herself that her position will never be upgraded to dean. “I’m just like. ‘OK. I’ve made my best shot at it.’” As a result, she perceives a glass ceiling for herself at this institution.

Just a mystery to me why (the provost) doesn’t want me to be a dean or (the provost) doesn’t want to have a dean, whatever way you want to phrase it. Objectively, I do have to go outside of my institution to become dean, and whether that means my institution has more gender inequality than another institution, I don’t think we can ever prove that.

Lucy has begun exploring administrative opportunities elsewhere but does not rule out returning to faculty. “After a certain point, people like myself, we quit trying….It becomes so frustrating, and you really begin to doubt yourself….You lose confidence. You lose sleep, and it’s exhausting. It’s just not worth it.”

While the culture of Lucy’s institution has evolved over the years, remnants of the Southern traditions it was built upon remain embedded.

Those were the rules I didn’t know when I came. They were definitely gender based. I was told by a very traditional, White, Southern female—older woman in my department—that I lacked tact….I had to learn to be more fitting in with that context.

Women in administration on the campus tend to be “more deferential” and dress very conservatively.

Really long plain skirts. Very baggy, boring jackets. There’s a lot of trying to evade the body…Obviously, by the way I’m talking about it, I don’t follow that. I wear boots, dresses and pants. I figure if I’m not a dean I’m not going to dress like one.
Students also “have some very definite ideas of how women should act. I’m supposed to be nice, enthusiastic. I’ve learned all of that over time. I can code switch into that depending on what kind of course it is.”

Furthermore, the institution can be characterized as risk adverse much like the first European settlers in the region.

Everything we have built has been built on growth. Putting our nose to the grindstone, building things on a shoestring and really not taking risks or chances….I think risk averse means you pick the safer candidate, and safer is perceived as male, as a default, in our society. Women who come in as builders and change agents are seen as more of a risk. This belief leads to homosocial reproduction. “The old boys’ club is still the safe bet for most institutions.”

Overall, women are at a disadvantage in the institution. During searches, “there’s such a heightened anxiety around female authority that whenever a female candidate is named to a position, it’s only after a thorough vetting is that possible.” Males, on the other hand, are given preferential treatment, especially by the provost. For example, an associate provost “was made dean in the middle of summer with no open search, and the college that he is dean of…was created while everybody was away for summer break. You have no search. No vetting. No nothing.” Performance standards are also perceived as disparate.

Men can be only moderately competent or even sometimes what I would consider incompetent….They don’t get fired, and they don’t get pushed out. That’s the case with a couple of (the provost’s) deans who are male. The female deans, to my perception, work far harder because they have a lot more to prove. One male dean in particular, we
still can’t understand how he is employed. He is just really, really, really an underachiever.

There have also been issues with salary parity between male and female colleagues.

While this institution promotes gender equality through workshops and other initiatives funded by a grant, these efforts have not been enough to eliminate the masculinized culture. In addition, women in leadership positions serve as roadblocks rather than agents of change within the institution. “I have seen more than my fair share of women blocking women’s progress.”

Emergent Themes

Institutional barriers.

Masculinized institutional culture.

Masculinized cultures persist in our institutions of higher education, albeit at different levels of intensity, despite ongoing change efforts. Data provided by the participants shows how the societal-level constructs of gender-based stereotypes and leadership impact organizational culture to create disadvantage for women. This disadvantage began as relatively minor experiences but increased in significance as the participants advanced in their careers, ultimately resulting in the emergence of the glass ceiling.

Gender-based stereotypes.

Gender-based stereotypes, built upon “expectations about what members of a group are actually like (descriptive beliefs) and what they should be like (prescriptive beliefs)” (Eagly & Carli, 2007, p. 84), are brought into our institutions and affect culture by biasing how people think about and interact with others. Amanda, for example, shared that her campus-level dean “never was open to the possibility that I could actually learn something. The guy could learn something, but I couldn’t.” Additionally, those in her discipline, library and information science,
have “a more feminine style of going about things. We are very helpful. We believe that it’s not demeaning to be helpful, but other people [men] may think that if your helpful, you are in a subordinate position.” Expectations like these result in the women faculty of the School of Computing including Amanda being “ignored” by their male peers. Lucy sees men, not women, being attributed “gravitas.”

There’s something about a middle-aged man that is just taken more seriously than a middle-aged woman. I don’t color my hair deliberately, because I’m not going to go and pretend to meet some female beauty standard. Even with my salt and pepper hair, I don’t get the gravitas points. I wear glasses. I don’t get the gravitas points for that. I’ve been told I’m confident. I’m articulate. I’m persuasive. Don’t get gravitas points for that either…. (The associate provost) made the case that he could do this job, and he should be in this particular job. (The provost) responded. (The provost) believed him. I think when women do those things, it’s seen as pushy. It’s seen as opportunistic. It’s seen as self-interested…. That’s what the men bring to the table is a trust in their authority and their judgment, because they are men.

As a result, male colleagues are offered more opportunities at Lucy’s institution. Finally, Monique explained that not being included in meetings, decisions, et cetera is one way in which she is affected at her institution by bias from both gender-based and racial stereotypes. “I’m the department chair, and I’m not invited to sit around the table.”

Over the years, the bias created by gender-based stereotypes has evolved from overt discrimination into a more unconscious and subtle form. Heidi characterized her experience as
implicit bias. I think it bothers me more simply because he [the provost] had been the PI on this grant that was all about this stuff. Hours of sitting through trainings and workshops and research. That it’s like, *is it not getting through?*

Amanda, also speaking to the unconscious nature of her colleague’s actions, characterized her male co-workers as wearing “blinders” and being “very tefloni. Things don’t soak in.” Monique and Lucy also commented on how small inequalities can accumulate to create disadvantage. For example, Monique characterized her experiences as “the types of *slights* that occur on the regular. It’s just the continual straws on the camel’s back.”

*Leadership.*

Overall, the models of leadership preferred by our institutions of higher education are built upon “culturally masculine qualities” (Eagly & Sczesny, 2009, p. 25). Amanda described the School of Computing’s “very narrow conception of what a leader was. A leader is somebody who is top down, who has the answer and who will tell you what to do.” This preference for autocratic, or authoritarian, leadership conflicted with her collaborative leadership style. She believes this is one of the primary reasons she did not obtain the campus-level dean position. “There are different ways of managing. I’m not trying to force anybody into any one, but I want them to realize that there are different ways of managing. Many of these are very gender related.”

Monique works at an institution “that was formerly all male. I think, in some ways, we still have that mentality. Particularly, when it comes to leadership.” Male senior staff members were “nervous about the black girl running the program. This is their high-profile program. It’s executive leadership which typically refers to men, so to speak. Who was this girl running this program that brings in all this money?” Women that have successfully ascended the ladder at
her institution such as the CFO have “had to morph into being one of the boys.” Monique has chosen to maintain her collaborative leadership style that includes talking about issues.

Lucy shared how women’s leadership is viewed as “risky,” especially at her institution that was built upon Southern traditions. “Women who come in as builders and change agents are seen as more of a risk. While I’ve done what I was supposed to do, some of the things I did [e.g. changing a scholarship program] are really risky.” Lucy believes that these decisions disadvantaged her during her attempts to be promoted to dean. This is an example of the double bind women often face when exercising leadership. It is created when attempting to “reconcile the communal qualities people prefer in women with the agentic qualities that people expect in managers” (Haveman & Beresford, 2012, p. 124). Ultimately, women are criticized for not acting in ways that support their gender role.

Heidi admitted that she has “thought a lot about how women perform leadership in academic institutions and what seems to be more successful than others.” For her, successful leaders are the ones who have this kind of veneer around them. You don’t really see who they are. You don’t really know who they are. Maybe that’s what it takes. I don’t know. I guess for me—I don’t think I willing to do that. It’s not who I am and that’s not who I want to be, but it does make me wonder if that’s what needed.

When adopting a veneer, women typically incorporate the agentic qualities expected of leaders which can lead to a double bind like it did for Heidi’s colleague. “People make these comments about her [the only female dean on campus]. ‘Ahh, I wouldn’t mess with her.’ ‘Oh, she’s kind of scary.’ That she is very brusque.”
Gender-based stereotypes combined with a preference for male models of leadership results in homosocial reproduction within our institutions. All of the participants shared that while a few women have broken through the glass ceiling in their institutions by in large senior leadership remains dominated by White males.

**Gendered organizational practices.**

*Recruitment, promotion and tenure.*

In our institutions of higher education, policies and practices related to recruitment, promotion and tenure are gendered to the advantage of men. Heidi described her university as not having “a lot of clear structures for hiring and not a lot of training” for those involved in searches. As a result, she believes personal biases impact who is hired.

It was interesting because one of the people who went to go see him after my search last year—to kind of call him on the carpet a bit—said to him, “You do recognize that every time there’s been a national search only the man is hired? You do recognize what that looks like?” He said, “Oh, yeah?” He never thought about that.

To counteract the effects of bias in searches, she recommended having “a conversation about implicit bias before you start reviewing finalists…you just say, ‘Alright. We have these biases da, da, da.’ The people are aware. They go in with that lens.” Heidi also shared that there needs to be more transparency around why one candidate is selected over another. Those involved in the decision-making process should be able to provide “evidence” that they evaluated candidates according to job requirements not hidden, biased expectations. During Heidi’s search, the provost was looking for someone that had the same “linear experience. He went from faculty member to department chair to dean to provost.” The provost held Heidi’s lack of experience as a department chair against her even though it was not listed as a job requirement.
At Lucy’s institution, women are held to a higher standard when vetted during recruitment or promotion. “There’s such a heightened anxiety around female authority that whenever a female candidate is named to a position, it’s only after a thorough vetting is that possible.” Men, on the other hand, have been named to positions with “no search. No vetting. No nothing.” Additionally, women wanting to become dean have historically had to look outside the institution because their credentials are not as valued as males or even external female candidates.

I do think that women have to move to become a dean, especially at my institution, and that makes it more difficult for some women to become deans. Every female dean at my institution moved here to become a dean…I have looked up the bios of the male deans, and all of them…were promoted from the ranks.

Of the eight women that became department chairs around the same time as Lucy, “the only one to become a dean left the university to do so. One is a new associate dean, and there’s of course my position (which is seen as above department chair but not really a dean).”

Amanda explained that the criteria for promotion in the School of Computing disadvantages women by placing an emphasis on grantsmanship. “I’m not a full professor, and I won’t be a full professor because their definition of full professor is somebody who gets a lot of high money research grants. In my field, that’s not it.” Large research grants are not common in library and information science, whereas in computer science, they are routine. Other schools choose to develop promotion and tenure standards by department in order to avoid this situation. “For example, the School of Engineering and Technology has two school-wide P&T standards: one for those in the engineering departments, and one for those in the technology departments (the former is more research-focused).”
Networking and mentors.

Social capital, a form of power that can be utilized in obtaining higher level leadership positions, is obtained through membership in social networks. All participants spoke of their networking efforts. Amanda shared that she knows a lot of people on her campus because of committee work she has done over the years and her role as president of the faculty council. Heidi talked about organizing and participating in statewide networking conferences funded by her institution’s ADVANCE grant from the National Science Foundation as well as attending professional development programs like the Higher Education Resources Services, HERS, leadership institute. Lucy routinely attends conferences for honors program leaders where she networks with colleagues from across the nation. Monique does extensive networking within the business community to recruit students for her program but admits that she is not a member of the “ol’ boys network” on her campus. Those that are “play golf”, “drink bourbon” and play “pool in the basement of the president’s house.” Generally, she dislikes campus politics. “I just don’t deal with bullshit very well.” None of the participants seem to have been able to develop connections with the right “power holders” (Eagly & Carli, 2007, p. 146) to further advance their careers.

In addition to providing access to social networks, mentors “provide guidance and support to help pave the path for mentees in achieving their career goals (Anderson & Ramey, 1990; Braun, 1990; Daloz, 1986; Thompson, 1990)” (T. M. Brown, 2005, p. 659). Monique shared that she met her most recent mentor while participating in a search at another institution. “The good thing about that search is that that provost turned out to be a mentor for me, because we had decided no matter what happens, ‘I really like you.’ So, now she’s one of my references.” Early in her career, Monique was mentored by a group of Black women that
advised her on topics such as negotiating job offers. Both Heidi and Amanda serve as mentors to junior faculty members. As interim dean, Heidi

   was helping everybody think about what are your next steps. How can I help you? What’s the professional development that you’re going to need, and how can I support that?...I think it’s important for the next generation of people to help them.

Amanda’s school does not have enough mentors to go around. “They’ve hired a lot of good people. In fact, that’s one of our problems. We’ve got some really interesting new faculty coming up, and we don’t have enough senior faculty to mentor them.” Lucy shared that she has mentored students. Since all participants acknowledged the importance of mentoring, it is noteworthy that only one spoke about having mentors and the positive impact it has had on her career.

   Individual barriers.

   Intentionality.

   None of the participants began their careers in higher education with the intention of going into administration. Lucy “planned to be a researcher and a teacher. The last thing I ever thought I would do is be administration.” In was about five years into Amanda’s career that she realized academic administration was

   something I liked. I think I was like a lot of librarians and professors. We want to do (librarianship or teaching/research) and not be a manager….In addition, in academia, there is a general (I think from observation) disdain for administrators, as being necessary evils. They aren’t real academics.

Monique, a first-generation college student,
learned about administrative leadership roles once I accepted my first faculty position. Administrators were folks that were located on separate floors or [in different] buildings who made decisions, but I wasn’t quite clear on their roles in relation to faculty. I learned the business of higher education on the job.

Heidi’s transition into administration “was just a matter of circumstances rather than anything purposeful.” For each, their transition into academic administration can be characterized as lacking intentionality. Once they realized they liked the work and were good at it, however, their career choices became more planned and focused on ascending the ladder.

*Human capital.*

Over the years, the participants have taken steps to prepare themselves for higher level leadership roles. Heidi, for example, attended a HERS leadership institute. “The whole idea behind HERS is that you are promoting and helping women to advance in the academic profession….The university paid for me to go through this very expensive experience.” Lucy has attended leadership training offered by her university as well as professional development programming for leaders of honors programs. Monique, who runs her institution’s executive leadership program, spoke about challenging herself to learn new things. Amanda shared that she went to the Frye Leadership Institute but was unable to take advantage of several other professional development opportunities that could have been helpful.

When I was interested in that and it was right in my career, they had a budget cut. They had no faculty fellows. At the time that they were gearing up these new leadership workshops, I was, all of the sudden, the interim dean and the department chair. I had no time.
One of the challenges women face when climbing the ladder in higher education administration is timing. Sometimes when professional development or promotion opportunities are available, personal circumstances prevent women from taking advantage of them. The reverse is true as well. As Lucy stated, “when you are ready to move up to the next level, it’s not always available at your institution.”

**Career aspirations.**

For the most part, the participants’ experiences with gender inequality and the emergence of the glass ceiling have personally impacted them to the point that they have modified their career aspirations. Amanda’s “got about eight more years of working, and I want to do it in stuff that’s personally rewarding.” Therefore, she is open to administrative positions outside the School of Computing such as in academic affairs or at another institution within her system. Amanda has decided that if she continues to be unsuccessful in obtaining a higher-level leadership position she will return to teaching full-time. “If worse comes to worse, I really do love my department, so that’s fine.” Lucy feels gender inequity almost physically, like a punch to the gut. I am always surprised (silly me), and I do take it personally. It makes me mad. I rage against it when talking with certain female friends and my husband. It just appears so clear and I really hate it when others can't see it. I know that I should just be philosophical about it, adapt my behavior so that I don't trigger certain reactions, but that's a challenge. I like being female, but I don't like the inequities I have faced.

Since Lucy is most interested in becoming dean of an honors college, she has applied for opportunities outside her university. “Maybe, I’ll try this one more time for a national search. If I don’t get something, I might just go back to the faculty, get a Fulbright [scholarship] and go to
France for a year.” Monique expressed that she is at a crossroads in her career because of the inequality she has experienced. “I’ve begun to reassess if academia is for me. Thinking about what my path moving forward will be. Dealing with the existential questions.” If Monique decides to remain in higher education, her goal is a “provost position where I have the larger institutional view”. Only Heidi remains steadfast in her career goal to become a college or university president. She has come to her “feminist self as a result of seeing how I've been treated unfairly or been dismissed because of my gender….I certainly take this knowledge into account when I do anything and use it to frame how I will respond or act in any situation. I can't take these gendered glasses off, so to speak.” While Heidi is “unhappy” with her current situation, she is confident that obtaining a higher-level leadership position is not a matter of if but when.

**Textural-structural Synthesis of the Experience of Gender Inequality**

The experience of gender inequality is one of disappointment, unhappiness, self-doubt, lost confidence, anger, and even rage. Women begin their careers in higher education with the expectation of being treated equitably, but over time, they find unconscious, subtle bias has largely replaced overt discrimination in the workplace. This bias is a result of gender-based stereotypes and a preference for more masculine models of leadership that are created at the societal level and brought with us into our institutions. For some women, the intersectionality of gender with race, age, ethnicity, et cetera intensifies the bias. Organizational practices that are gendered to the advantage of men also create disadvantage for women in the workplace. Women come to accept that small difficulties must be tolerated if they want to succeed in a masculinized culture, but over time, the disadvantages begin to accumulate which makes them more difficult to bear.
The glass ceiling emerges when women are denied higher level administrative positions due to accumulated disadvantage or the inequalities they have experienced extinguish the desire to even apply. While attempting to ascend the ladder, the inequalities women experience feel more significant and personal. They respond by questioning their abilities and debating internally if they did something wrong to create the situation. Only some will seek counsel from family and close friends. Gender inequality tends to be a fairly private experience. As a result of the emergence of the glass ceiling, most women modify their career aspirations. These modifications range from applying for opportunities outside of their current institution to returning to faculty or leaving higher education altogether. Overall, the experience of gender inequality not only impacts women’s career advancement but how they perceive themselves.
Chapter Five: Discussion, Implications and Recommendations

Using a phenomenological methodology, this qualitative study renewed the examination of gender inequality in higher education administration by allowing women who have experienced the glass ceiling phenomenon at Research Doctoral institutions to provide further meaning by sharing their stories. The purpose of the inquiry was to produce knowledge on how the glass ceiling manifests itself in the 21st century higher education workplace. Guiding this study was the research question, “What are the lived experiences of women who pursued an academic deanship at Research Doctoral institutions with gender inequality?” Five themes emerged from the data. They are: (a) masculinized institutional culture, (b) gendered organizational practices, (c) intentionality, (d) human capital, and (e) career aspirations. Ultimately, the research question was answered by producing a textural-structural synthesis, or “unified statement of the essences of the experience of the phenomenon as a whole” (Moustakas, 1994, p. 100), with the data drawn from the participants’ stories.

This final chapter presents a discussion of findings, implications for various audiences including women working in higher education administration, recommendations for further research, and a reflection on how the results of this study have affected my personal practice.

Discussion of Findings

The experiences of the participants confirm that the glass ceiling persists in higher education administration. It most often emerges when a woman is denied a promotion to a higher level leadership position due to accumulated disadvantage. However, it can also occur when the inequalities a woman has experienced extinguish her desire to apply for a promotion. The five themes that emerged from the data—masculinized institutional culture, gendered
organizational practices, intentionality, human capital, and career aspirations—represent the common barriers encountered by the participants while attempting to ascend the ladder.

The women in this study all desired a dean’s level position but found the pathway blocked due to their institution’s culture and practices that are gendered to the advantage of men. Gender-based stereotypes played a significant role in creating the barriers they faced. While they exist to help people make sense of the world around them, gender-based stereotypes are often used to limit what someone “should, could, and can accomplish….When schemas turn into prescriptive roles, sexism and discrimination occur” (Easterly & Ricard, 2011, p. 64). In particular, gender-based stereotypes influenced who were perceived as leaders and preferred leadership styles. Current literature on gender inequality continues to describe leadership as masculinized because the mental associations about leaders overlap significantly with those attributed to males (Berry & Franks, 2010; Bornstein, 2008; Eagly & Carli, 2007; Haveman & Beresford, 2012; Madden, 2005, 2011). Overall, the bias the participants experienced was subtle and implicit rather than overt discrimination. However, the inequalities accumulated over time eventually triggering the emergence of the glass ceiling.

The participants began their careers in higher education lacking intentionality for administration. While their transition was unplanned, each realized that they liked and were good at the work. As a result, the participants career choices became more strategic in order to advance upward in their institution. “Career planning has been found to have a positive impact on women’s career advancement (Hirsch, 1994) and is helpful in achieving high level leadership positions in the higher education setting (LeBlanc, 1993; Touchton et al., 1993).” (Lepkowski, 2009, p. 11) These choices included obtaining human capital primarily through training. The participants realized that they needed to improve and expand their skill sets related to
management and leadership because most doctoral programs do not prepare students for administrative roles. The emergence of the glass ceiling deeply affected the participants. Not only did it cause them to question their abilities but to reevaluate their career aspirations. Three of the four participants are either looking at returning to full-time faculty roles or leaving higher education altogether. Only one aspires to become a president but acknowledges that the emergence of the glass ceiling has delayed achievement of this goal.

Overall, this study’s findings support previous research on gender inequality in higher education administration. The glass ceiling does not appear to manifest itself differently in 21st century higher education based upon the emergent themes drawn from the participants experiences with the phenomenon. Since the problem of practice is ongoing and there has only been marginal progress in breaking down the barriers to obtaining higher level leadership positions, a new approach to generating understanding is required. Pierre Bourdieu’s social theory is being used for this purpose since it has only been utilized minimally to study gender inequality in the higher education context and has never been applied in research focusing on female administrators in American institutions of higher education.

Field.

For this study, the field in which action took place is higher education. It is “one of a series of relatively autonomous worlds or fields whose complex interrelations constitute society. Briefly, a field is defined as a configuration of positions comprising agents (individuals, groups of actors or institutions) struggling to maximize their position” (Maton, 2005, p. 689). Bourdieu (1993) sometimes refers to society as the field of power.

Each field is structured according to a unique logic represented by a set of rules “that are rather tacit in nature (Wacquant, 2011) and need to be internalized by the agents in order to
demonstrate appropriate practices and strategies (le sens du placement et du jeu; Bourdieu, 1983a)” (Walther, 2014, p. 8). This logic reflects the oppositions of the field (Bourdieu, 1993; Hilgers & Mangez, 2015; Maton, 2005). Additionally, “whatever its degree of independence, it [the higher education field] continues to be affected by the laws of the field [society] which encompasses it” (Bourdieu, 1993, p. 39).

The logic shaping higher education in the United States is comparable that of the French system which Bourdieu (1988) described in his work, Homo Academicus. These fields are principally structured by an opposition between agents possessing “scholastic capital” (scientific prestige and intellectual renown) and “academic capital” (institutional control over appointments, funding, etc.). Higher education is, therefore, hierarchically structured not only into “haves” and “have nots” but also by competing ideas of what should count as “having”. (Maton, 2005, p. 690)

Generally, faculty members are viewed as possessing scholastic capital whereas administrators hold academic capital. The participants in this study currently hold positions within the field such as professor, president of faculty council, program director, and department chair more closely associated with scholastic capital but desire to move within the field to a position, academic dean at a Research Doctoral institution, that requires more academic capital.

The higher education field is also structured according to the opposition between masculine and feminine which produces society’s gendered social order and sexual division of labor. In this opposition, men are considered dominant (Bourdieu, 2001). As a result, women enter the higher education field already dominated because of their gender.

Capital.
To gain entry into a field or change one’s position within the field various forms of capital including economic, cultural, social, and symbolic are “invested, exchanged, and accumulated” (Swartz, 1997, p. 44). Capitals can also have sub-types (Bourdieu, 1986/1997). In the higher education field, scholastic capital and academic capital are types of cultural capital.

Overall, the participants struggled with obtaining the right types and volumes of capital needed to move within the higher education field to the desired position. Specifically, they lacked the requisite academic and social capitals.

Academic capital is obtained and maintained by holding a position enabling domination of other positions and their holders…this power over the agencies of reproduction of the university body ensures for its holders a statutory authority, a kind of function-related attribute which is much more linked to hierarchical position than to any extraordinary properties of the work or the person. (Bourdieu, 1988, p. 84)

The participants in this study have not had the opportunity to accumulate the academic capital necessary for the dean’s role since they have spent most of their careers focused on their faculty roles.

Academic power can only be accumulated and maintained at the cost of constant and heavy expenditure of time. The result is, as Weber has already noted, that the acquisition and exercise of administrative power in the university field – that of dean or recteur [vice-chancellor], for example…tends in fact to compromise the accumulation of a capital of scientific authority and vice versa. (Bourdieu, 1988, pp. 95-96)

Additionally, the participants did not exchange capital that they already possessed for this form of power, possibly because they lacked the social capita required.
Bourdieu (1986/1997) defined social capital as “the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition--or in other words, to membership in a group” (p. 51). While the participants in this study belonged to numerous social groups, they were not members of the network on their campuses, commonly characterized as old boys club, that wield the most power over promotions within academic administration.

A dominant theme in research on women’s careers has been their exclusion from influential networks (see for example Metz & Tharenou, 2001). Women are seen to be outsiders who, according to Burt (1998), have to borrow social capital to try to gain legitimacy….Furthermore, it has been shown that women tend to use social networks in a different way to men, fulfilling social rather than utilitarian purposes (Terjeson, 2005).

(Duberley & Cohen, 2010, p. 189)

These networks represent the dominant class in the higher education field. “Dominant classes are set apart from dominated classes by the overall volume of capital they possess.” (Sapiro, 2015a, p. 779) Mentors can provide access to social networks by vouching for the individual desiring membership. Only one participant, Monique, talked about having a mentor, but this woman was from outside the institution and lacked the necessary connections to be helpful. Ultimately, “capital breeds capital, and holding positions conferring social influence determines and justifies holding new positions, themselves invested with all the weight of their combined holders” (Bourdieu, 1988, p. 85).

Human capital, one of the themes identified in the data and presented in Chapter Four, is not a recognized form of capital for Bourdieu. In fact, he is critical of the concept of human capital.
From the very beginning, a definition of human capital, despite its humanistic connotations, does not move beyond economism and ignores, \textit{inter alia}, the fact that the scholastic yield from educational action depends on the cultural capital previously invested by the family. (Bourdieu, 1986/1997, p. 48)

For Bourdieu (1986/1997), “academic qualifications” (p. 50) such as degrees, certificates or non-credit training are cultural capital in the institutionalized state. This state of cultural capital exists within scholastic capital and was possessed in varying amounts by all participants.

\textbf{Habitus.}

When agents internalize the logic of fields, it produces habitus, “systems of durable, transposable dispositions,” \textsuperscript{1} structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures” (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 72). Habitus is “the product of our past and present experiences” (Walther, 2014, p. 13) and “functions at every moment as a matrix of perceptions, appreciations and actions and makes possible the achievement of infinitely diversified tasks” (Bourdieu, 1977, pp. 82-83). Habitus operates “below the level of consciousness and language through a ‘feel for the game’” (Adkins, 2004b, p. 194). “Habitus and field stand in a dialectic relationship whereby the field constructs the habitus, but the habitus also constructs the field by endowing it with ‘meaning’, ‘sense’ and ‘value’ (McNay 2000:38)” (Huppatz, 2006, p. 128)

Oppositions structuring the field come “to life via the habitus. The habitus is the practical operator, the principle that generates the ‘regular improvization’ that Bourdieu terms social practice” (Krais, 2006, p. 121). For Bourdieu (2001),

the division between the sexes appears to be “in the order of things”, as people sometimes say to refer to what is normal, natural, to the point of being inevitable: it is present both – in the objectified state – in things (in the house, for example, every part of which is
“sexed”), in the whole social world, and – in the embodied state – in the habitus of the agents, functioning as systems of schemes of perception, thought and action. (p. 8)

As a result, habitus and its embedded dispositions are viewed as gendered.

Both gender-based stereotypes and a preference for masculine models of leadership played a role in the participants’ experiences with inequality. These constructs rooted in the gendered social order and sexual division of labor are manifestations of how individual and group habitus is gendered to the advantage of men. Institutions of higher education, the third type of agent operating within the field, are “determined (or guided) in its 'choices' not only by its position in the structure of the field of production, but also by its internal structure which, as a product of all its earlier history, still orients its present” (Bourdieu, 2005, p. 69). Within organizations, the habitus of its members affects organizational culture and practices. It is through this relationship that culture became masculinized and practices were gendered.

The participants’ experiences of gender inequality, especially the emergence of the glass ceiling, caused a shift in the participants’ dispositions, or habitus. Women who normally would be characterized as self-assured became somewhat unconfident. Lucy explained this change best in stating,

I am not a perfect administrator -- like everyone, I have strengths and weaknesses. But, overall, I am a pretty good one, and I have been very effective as a leader at my institution. I have seen some deans and chairs who are far less effective than I am. These experiences of gender inequity always leave me feeling that maybe it's me? That's the really unfortunate part of this, that I begin to doubt myself and my abilities. I certainly am less self-confident than I was at age 40.
As a result of this shift, the participants modified their career aspirations to eliminate “hysteresis…the disruption in the relationship between *habitus* and the field structures to which they no longer correspond” (Hardy, 2014, pp. 128-129). This “adaptation to external constraints” (Swartz, 1997, p. 291) is a type of agency embedded in habitus. “The hysteresis of habitus…is doubtless one of the foundations of the structural lag between opportunities and the dispositions to grasp them which is the cause of missed opportunities.” (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 83)

**Social reproduction.**

Historically, the higher education field has been highly autonomous, “defined by a ‘social compact’ between higher education and political, economic and social interests that insulated universities from wider pressures” (Maton, 2005, p. 695). It has been able to maintain this state through its self-reproductive capacity and its vested interest in protecting the value of scholastic capital. Referring to Durkheim, he [Bourdieu] points to the educational system’s capacity to recruit its leadership from within its own ranks as the reason for its unusual historical continuity and stability, analogous more to the church than to business or the state (Bourdieu and Passeron 1997: 195-98). Education’s virtual monopoly over recruitment, training, and promotion of personnel allows the educational system to adapt its programs and activities to its own specific needs for self-perpetuation. (Swartz, 1997, p. 206)

Within the higher education field, “positions of power are hierarchized” (Bourdieu, 1988, p. 87) and agents compete for positions associated with greater power. Consequently, agents holding these positions “have a certain interest in the maintenance of the established order or the modification of this order within limits that enable them to strengthen their domination” (Hilgers & Mangez, 2015, p. 11).
Bourdieu’s theory of social reproduction is considered a cultural reproduction model (Macris, 2011) where social inequality is represented by dominant/dominated positions within a field (Bourdieu, 1984).

By ingraining or legitimising the existing social structures, which are objectively recognized as legitimate authority, dominant classes are able to uphold power and control, while subordinated groups remain disempowered (Bourdieu and Passeron, 1977)….The dominant culture (that which reinforces the arbitrary power) uses cultural capital in a covert way to inculcate their arbitrary truths and thus replicate the existing social structures. (Macris, 2011, pp. 33-34)

In the higher education field, gender inequality is perpetuated by agents holding dominant positions utilizing the masculinized cultures and gendered organizational practices within our institutions to impede the acquisition and use of cultural capital of those in dominated positions.

The glass ceiling concept does not exist within Pierre Bourdieu’s social theory. However, it can be envisioned as the inability of agents due to gender to accumulate the necessary cultural capital to move to positions within a field associated with greater power.

Since the glass ceiling is a manifestation of gender inequality, social reproduction explain why agents are unable to accumulate the cultural capital necessary to obtain higher-level leadership positions.

**Implications for Practice**

By utilizing Pierre Bourdieu’s social theory to interpret this study’s findings, numerous implications for practice on ways to mitigate and ultimately eliminate gender inequality were produced. They are presented according to the three distinct audiences identified in Chapter
One—women working in higher education administration, institutions of higher education and policymakers and social scientists—for this research.

**Women working in higher education administration.**

The experience of gender inequality including the emergence of the glass ceiling is deeply personal. It changes how women feel about their abilities and their career aspirations. Due to the opposition between masculine/feminine that structures the field of power, gendered habitus and the field’s need “for self-perpetuation” (Swartz, 1997, p. 206), women working in higher education will likely experience some form of gender inequality during their careers. By entering the field with this knowledge, they can be proactive and take steps to mitigate its effects.

A key strategy for women aspiring to ascend the ladder in academic administration is to become more purposeful in accumulating social capital and to begin the effort earlier in their careers.

The volume of social capital possessed by a given agent thus depends on the size of the network of connections he can effectively mobilize and the volume of the capital…possessed in his own right by each of those to whom he is connected.¹³ (Bourdieu, 1986/1997, p. 51)

Consequently, women must selectively build their networks by “establishing or reproducing social relationships that are directly usable in the short or long term” (Bourdieu, 1986/1997, p. 52). Ideally, these connections should directly or indirectly hold power over promotion within the institution. Mentors can help identify these individuals and possibly provide introductions to them. “The key to a good strategic network is leverage: the ability to marshal information, support, and resources from one sector of a network to achieve results in another.” (Ibarra & Hunter, 2007, para. 19) The capital building process takes time and focused effort. Women
should begin accumulating social capital when they enter the higher education field rather than shortly before they anticipate needing to use it.

Additionally, the capital building process requires individuals to have the “disposition to play the game” (Bourdieu, 1988, p. 89). Historically, women have been socialized to believe that competition is masculine. “Their whole upbrinng prepares them rather to enter the game vicariously, that is, in a position that is both external and subordinate.” (Bourdieu, 2001, p. 78) As a result, many women find adopting the mindset required to accumulate capital difficult. Women wanting to obtain higher level leadership positions must find a way to actively engage in the game even if it is uncomfortable or seems unnatural. Mentors can serve as a source of emotional support (Ballenger, 2010; T. M. Brown, 2005) through this process. It is important, therefore, that women proactively seek at least one mentor (T. M. Brown, 2005) that can serve in this capacity.

**Institutions of higher education.**

Just like people, organizations are a product of their history. Higher education in the United States was built upon traditions brought over from Europe designed to advantage men. They maintained control of our institutions for decades because masculinized cultures and gendered organizational practices make it difficult for women to obtain the capital needed to obtain positions associated with greater power. Most institutions of higher education have made a concerted effort to become more gender equitable workplaces. However, their interventions have not completely broken the cycle of reproduction that perpetuates inequality as evidenced by the participants’ experiences.

Institutional change efforts must find ways to overcome “the inertia of habitus” (Bourdieu, 2001, p. 89) in order to fully embrace the changes to society’s sexual division of
labor that are underway. Male allies, a strategy first introduced to the researcher by one of this study’s participants, could be utilized. Ashcraft, DuBow, Eger, Blithe, and Sevier (2013) found that men are motivated to become advocates for gender diversity in the workplace through “having a minority experience themselves; relationships with their wives, daughters, and mothers; having had female bosses, mentors, or colleagues; attending workshops on bias; and witnessing biases in action” (p. 9) and recommended that organizations find ways to “recreate some of these influential experiences” (p. 14). Through the process of becoming allies, men’s habitus would be affected. “Among men with high awareness of gender bias there was a marked tendency to break from traditional masculine conventions.” (Prime & Moss-Racusin, 2009, p. 6) As a result of the weakening between the fundamental opposition between masculine/feminine, institutional cultures and practices would become more gender neutral allowing women greater opportunity to accumulate the capital necessary to ascend into positions of power.

**Policymakers and social scientists.**

In an androcentric society like the United States, men are dominant in the opposition between masculine/feminine. This inequality has been reproduced for generations. Since habitus is responsible for the reproduction of social structures (Dumais, 2002; Krais, 2006; Macris, 2011), the only way to eliminate gender inequality is to change dispositions. “While Bourdieu is not rigidly deterministic, as some critics charge, his conceptual framework is clearly more attentive to patterns of continuity than to change.” (Swartz, 1997, p. 290) Individuals possess limited agency, therefore “profound social change results not from a revolt of the great individual, but from the political action of many individuals: from social movements” (Krais, 2006, p. 131). In regards to gender inequality, Bourdieu (2001) stated, “only political action…will be able, no doubt in the long term and with the aid of the contradictions inherent in
the various mechanisms or institutions concerned, to contribute to the progressive withering away of masculine domination” (p. 117). Social scientists and policymakers should interpret this statement as a call to heighten public discourse on gender inequality and to support the recent resurgence of the women’s movement. In the 1960s and 1970s, significant change regarding what is perceived as masculine/feminine occurred because the problem had society’s attention. Progress on breaking the cycle of reproduction that perpetuates gender inequality will begin again when society gives it as much consideration as immigration policy, gun control or the opioid crisis.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

While reflecting upon the results of this study, several recommendations for future research on this problem of practice emerged. First, due to the nature of phenomenological inquiry, only the experiences of women who pursued an academic deanship at Research Doctoral institutions with gender inequality were explored. Therefore, this study produced knowledge on how the glass ceiling manifests itself in the 21st century higher education workplace for a single group of women. This study should be replicated with women vying for other positions within academic administration such as department chair and at other types of institutions to see if similar findings are produced.

Next, in the literature, feminist writers including McCall (1992), Lovell (2000) and Laberge (1995) recommend an extension of Pierre Bourdieu’s social theory in which gendered dispositions are considered a form of embodied cultural capital. “Gendered dispositions have the same properties as the other states of cultural capital; that is, gendered dispositions work also as sources of power (as in the case with educational credentials and possession of cultural goods).” (Laberge, 1995, p. 138) Traditionally, gendered cultural capital has advantaged men. However,
there is some evidence that femininity as cultural capital is beginning to have broader currency in unexpected way. Demand for stereotypically feminine skills is generally increasing on the labour market…Working class femininity may begin to have a competitive market advantage compared to the attributes of traditional working-class masculinity, and this shift may have profound effects on ‘la domination masculine’ Lovell (2000, p. 42).

Women can obtain and use masculine gendered capital but it creates a double bind. “Women who do acquire masculine traits never escape their sex-stereotyped dispositions. Still classified as women, but in particular, as women who act like men, they are subject to a corresponding social sanction.” (McCall, 1992, p. 845)

Cursory evidence showing how gendered dispositions can be used as a form of power was found in the data gathered from the participants in this study. Amanda, for example, shared that at her institution women’s leadership styles are embraced more in schools that encompass a wider variety of academic disciplines. “They go across the aboard, and so I think that they naturally have to develop appreciation for difference.” Thus, women wanting to ascend the ladder in these schools can utilize their gendered dispositions, their femininities, as embodied cultural capital in the promotion process. Lucy talked about how men utilize gravitas, a masculine disposition, as a source of power within institutions of higher education to win at the game. “That’s what the men bring to the table is a trust in their authority and their judgment, because they are men.” Further empirical research utilizing a grounded theory approach should be conducted in order to assess this extension of Bourdieu’s work. This design is helpful when “theories may be present, but they are incomplete because they do not address potentially valuable variables of interest to the researcher” (Creswell, 2007, p. 66).
The final recommendation is intersectionality theory could be used in conjunction with Pierre Bourdieu’s social theory as theoretical framework in future studies of gender inequality in higher education administration. “Intersectional analysis posits that we should not understand the combining of identities as additively increasing one’s burden but instead as producing \textit{substantively distinct experiences}.” (Symington, 2004, p. 2) Monique, one of the participants in this study, shared that her positionality within the game is always going to be impacted by the intersection of race, gender, and class. Those facets of identity serve to marginalize me within “the game”.

My understanding of “the game” comes from the streets; that’s the lens I use. Currently, socio-occupational stratification is the primary organizing method for class in Bourdieu’s work. Gender is considered a secondary, structuring criterion along with age, marital status, ethnicity, geographic place of residence, et cetera (Bourdieu, 1984; Dumais, 2002; Laberge, 1995; Lovell, 2000; McCall, 1992; Skeggs, 2004a; Swartz, 1997). In the combined model, Bourdieu’s social theory would remain largely unchanged except that class would be defined from an intersectionality perspective.

\textbf{Personal Reflection}

When I began this study several years ago, I had no plans on becoming an advocate for gender equality despite my personal experiences with sexual harassment and the glass ceiling. Age and experience have a funny way of changing one’s plans. Utilizing this study’s results as well as my coursework on leadership and experience as a higher education administrator, I would like to consult with institutions across the country on how to create, implement and assess the effectiveness of women’s leadership programs as well as help institutions craft policies and procedure that support women’s advancement. As part of this initiative, I would design training
modules on topics such as capital, networking, mentoring, and male allies that could be utilized individually or all together as a comprehensive curriculum. Through this work, I will enact change by helping institutions to create more gender neutral organizational cultures.

During participant recruitment, I had the privilege of speaking with women from across the country. They shared with me powerful stories about their experiences with gender inequality while working in our institutions of high education. While most of these women did not qualify to participate for one reason or another, I am honored that they chose to open up to me about their difficulties and inspired by their resiliency. Several encouraged me to continue conducting research on this topic and to write a book. Maybe someday.

Finally, the results of this study shed new light on my own experiences with gender inequality. Specifically, they made me think about how I need to adjust my networking strategies and use of accumulated capital in order to better prepare for future opportunities within the higher education field.

**Conclusion**

By utilizing an atypical lens, Pierre Bourdieu’s social theory, to further explore the barriers women face in their pursuit of leadership positions, this study extended the body of knowledge on gender inequality in higher education administration by uncovering (a) the role capital plays in the emergence and maintenance of the glass ceiling in the 21st century higher education workplace, and (b) how the habitus of agents in the field is affected by the experience.

Considerable work remains in order for perceptions of what is masculine and feminine to become equitable in American society. With the recent spotlight on sexual harassment and assault in Hollywood as well as the resurrection of the women’s movement exemplified by the January 2017 Women’s March in Washington, DC and at solidarity events around the country, I
am hopeful that the elimination of gender inequality including the glass ceiling phenomenon is once again becoming a strategic priority of our nation. Further action not only benefits women currently working in higher education administration but their daughters and granddaughters with aspirations to join the field.
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Appendix A

Call to Participate

Research Study on Gender Inequality in Higher Education Administration
Seeks Volunteer Participants

A research study exploring the experiences of women who have undergone gender inequality during their pursuit of academic leadership positions is being conducted. You may be eligible to participate if you:

- are employed by a Research Doctoral institution as defined by the Carnegie Classification™;
- have never served as an academic dean or higher at a Research Doctoral institution; and
- experienced within the past 10 years what you believe to be the glass ceiling while pursuing a promotion to academic dean at a Research Doctoral institution and were unsuccessful in obtaining the position.

Confidential interviews with those selected to participate will occur during April through June 2017. There is no compensation for participating. Participation is voluntary.

If you have questions or are interested in being a part of this study, please send an e-mail that includes your phone number and best time to reach you to Merilee Madera, MBA at madera.m@husky.neu.edu

This research is being conducted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Education degree from the College of Professional Studies at Northeastern University.
Appendix B

Unsigned Informed Consent Form

Northeastern University, College of Professional Studies, Department of Education
Dr. Karen Reiss Medwed, Principal Investigator / Merilee Madera, Student Researcher
Title of Project: Pursuing Leadership Positions in Higher Education: A Phenomenological Exploration of Female Administrators’ Experiences with Gender Inequality

Request to Participate in Research

You are invited to take part in a research study being conducted to better understand why gender inequality persists in higher education administration.

You are being asked to participate because you are a woman that believes she has experienced the glass ceiling phenomenon within the past ten years while pursuing a promotion that you didn’t receive to academic dean at a Research Doctoral institution.

You must be at least 18 years old to be in this research project. The researcher will explain the study to you, review this document and answer any questions you have. You may elect not to participate.

If you decide to participate in this study, you will be asked to describe your experience with gender inequality during a confidential interview. Your responses will be audio taped using a digital recorder while the researcher takes notes. Additionally, during the data analysis phase of this project, you will be asked to review and comment via e-mail on excerpts of the description of your experience prepared by the researcher from the data you supplied.

Interviews will be conducted at a time that is convenient for you either in-person at a location of your choice or using a video conferencing application such as Skype for Business. It is anticipated that you will be interviewed once or twice with each session lasting 45 to 90 minutes. Reviewing the description of your experience will take 25 to 35 minutes to complete.

The possible risks or discomforts of the study are minimal. Experiences of gender inequality can be difficult to discuss. Consequently, you may be uncomfortable at times during the interview process. In order to alleviate this discomfort, you may decline to answer any question asked. In addition, you may choose to share only select details of your experience with the researcher.

There are no direct benefits to you for participating in the study. However, this study’s findings could allow the researcher to create implications for policy and practice on ways to mitigate and ultimately eliminate the glass ceiling phenomenon in higher education administration.
**Your part in this study will be handled in a confidential manner.** Only the researcher will know you participated and what data you provided. A pseudonym will be assigned to each participant (ex. Participant #1) and used in any reports or publications based on this research. Therefore, the data you provide should not be traceable back to you.

In rare instances, an authorized representative of Northeastern University’s Office of Human Subject may request to see research information about you and other people in this study. This is done only to be sure that the research is done properly.

**The decision to participate in this research project is up to you.** You do not have to participate and you can refuse to answer any question. Even if you begin the study, you may withdraw at any time by either calling or e-mailing the researcher. Any data you have already provided will immediately be destroyed.

**You will not be paid for your participation in this study.** Additionally, you will not incur any costs for participating.

**If you have any questions about this study,** please feel free to contact the researcher, Merilee Madera at madera.m@husky.neu.edu or (724) 579-0253. You may also contact her advisor, Dr. Karen Reiss Medwed at k.reissmedwed@northeastern.edu

**If you have any questions about your rights in this research,** you may contact Nan C. Regina, Director of Human Subject Research Protection, 360 Huntington Avenue, Mail Stop: 560-177, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115. E-mail: n.regina@northeastern.edu / Telephone: (617) 373-4588. You may call anonymously if you wish.

You may keep this form for yourself.

Thank you.

*Merilee Madera*
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Notice of IRB Action

Northeastern

Notification of IRB Action

Date: April 24, 2017
IRB #: CPS17-03-13

Principal Investigator(s):
Karen Reiss Medwed
Merilee Madera

Department:
Doctor of Education
College of Professional Studies

Address:
20 Belvidere
Northeastern University

Title of Project:
Pursuing Leadership Positions in Higher Education: A Phenomenological Exploration of Female Administrators’ Experiences with Gender Inequality

Participating Sites:
N/A

Informed Consent:
One (1) unsigned consent

As per CFR 45.46.117(c)(2) signed consent is being waived as the research presents no more than minimal risk of harm to subjects and involves no procedures for which written consent is normally required.

DHHS Review Category:
Expedited #6, #7

Monitoring Interval:
12 months

Approval Expiration Date: APRIL 23, 2018

Investigator’s Responsibilities:
1. Informed consent form bearing the IRB approval stamp must be used when recruiting participants into the study.
2. The investigator must notify IRB immediately of unexpected adverse reactions, or new information that may alter our perception of the benefit-risk ratio.
3. Study procedures and files are subject to audit any time.
4. Any modifications of the protocol or the informed consent as the study progresses must be reviewed and approved by this committee prior to being instituted.
5. Continuing Review Approval for the proposal should be requested at least one month prior to the expiration date above.
6. This approval applies to the protection of human subjects only. It does not apply to any other university approvals that may be necessary.

C. Randall Colvin, Ph.D., Chair
Northeastern University Institutional Review Board

Nan C. Regina, Director
Human Subject Research Protection

Northeastern University FWA #4630
Appendix D

Interview Guide

1. How do you think the other people involved perceived the situation?

2. What contextual factors stand out for you?

3. How do you feel about “playing the game” to obtain a promotion?

4. What forms of capital have you acquired and used in obtaining higher level management positions during your career?

5. What forms of capital do you feel you still need to acquire and why?

6. What steps, if any, do you feel need to be taken to alter the balance of power between men and women in order for gender inequality to be eliminated?