DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 177 975 HE 011 854

AUTHOR Moore, Kathryn M.; Sangaria, Mary Ann Dancwitz
TITLE Mobility and Mentoring: Indications from a Study of Women Administrators.
PUB DATE Apr 79
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the National Conference of the American Association for Higher Education (Washington, D.C., April 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Personnel; *Administrator Characteristics; Career Development; *Career Opportunities; *Females; Higher Education; *Occupational Mobility; Role Models; Sex Differences
IDENTIFIERS *Administrators; *Mentors; Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

The study explored the career and professional socialization patterns of top women administrators in comparison to their male counterparts. A 24-item questionnaire was developed and 89 usable questionnaires were returned from women administrators in Pennsylvania. Subjects were classified into one of three position categories--major academic, middle academic, and major support. Background characteristics, such as age, marital status, and education, are reviewed. Findings revealed that many women had changed positions recently; the majority of women, however, have built their careers in one institution. Forty percent of the women said they anticipated a move to another position within the next five years. As to the question of a mentor, only about one third of the major academic respondents indicated that a mentor was important to them in their careers. The other two categories of women administrators were split nearly evenly between those who had mentors and those who did not. The majority of women felt that having held a particular position was the significant career influence. As the findings were limited to Pennsylvania, the sample was considered too specific to permit generalizations. (PHR)

Mobility and Mentoring:

Indications from a Study of Women Administrators

Kathryn M. Moore
Associate Professor & Research Associate

Mary Ann Danowitz Sagaria
Research Assistant

Center for the Study of Higher Education
The Pennsylvania State University

A paper presented at the National Conference of the American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C., April, 1979.

"The Second Struggle" is an informal title that has been given to women's efforts to move up to positions of leadership and authority in all sections of American society (Wikler, 1978). The second struggle does not presume satisfactory completion of the first struggle, which concerns gaining equal access and opportunity for women, but rather it builds on the momentum of the first and adds to it. Looking at women's administrative careers in light of this second struggle, the questions center on how many women are moving up into higher levels of administration and what are the forces or factors assisting and/or inhibiting them.

Research on women as administrators is not abundant. Little is actually known although much is presumed about women's behavior in positions of academic leadership and responsibility. Certainly a common presumption has been that there are differences between men and women administrators and that these differences reflect negatively upon women. It is also true, however, that the number of women who hold top level positions in higher education has been few, in the range of 6 to 9 percent. Moreover, the kinds of positions women have held in colleges and universities has been confined to a small number of positions, and a narrow band of institutions, predominately private sectarian and women's colleges. For this reason, the opportunity to study women administrators in numbers and contexts similar to men has not been, and still is not, available (Moore and Wollitzer, 1979).

Men have tended to rise to chief executive positions in higher education by following a fairly standard career line. Beginning with the terminal degree and professional experience in a discipline, they gain tenure and senior status in a department then move to be chairman, dean or provost, and

so on up the line. This sequence of experiences constitutes the normative career ladder to top-level positions in academe. Thus even though individuals may deviate from this model, and even though many more men fit the criteria than are ever chosen for top-level posts, nevertheless this particular career ladder has salience both as a model and as perceived reality. Consequently, it is also the model against which women's careers in academe can and are being measured. Thus, the first question we framed in our study is: Do the career patterns of top women administrators reflect the traditional male career model? This is, (a) do these women possess comparable educational and work experiences, and (b) do they exhibit comparable kinds of career mobility by which men have achieved executive positions?

The limited research we have on women's mobility suggests that they are not mobile. For example, Arter (1973) found that women administrators in land-grant and state universities tended to build their career at one institution and that they took much longer to rise to the top than did their male colleagues. Thus whether mobility is measured as moves across institutions or within an institution, it has been suggested that women are less mobile than men. We were interested to see if a study of Pennsylvania women would confirm this finding or if such a study might show that policies of affirmative action which came into effect after 1971 were having an effect. Since much of the mobility research was done prior to this time, perhaps changes have taken place; if so, they ought to be evident by an examination of the time of appointment of the women in the study. Thus it seemed to us that any assessment of career mobility implies several dimensions that we hoped to explore.

The second question of the study focuses on professional socialization. There is much talk in academic circles these days about the "old boy network,"

"gatekeepers," and "mentors." These terms derive from a convergence of observation and organizational research. In his classic study of the differences between the American and British educational systems, Turner (1960) pointed out that education promotes two kinds of upward mobility, sponsored and contest. He felt that British education exemplified the system of sponsored mobility while American education with its rhetoric of merit and competition exemplified contest mobility. Subsequent research especially in the setting of the American corporation, (Jennings, 1971; Levinson, 1978), and with regard to college presidents (Cohen and March, 1974) as well as the observations of an increasing number of academics including many feminists (Touchton and Shavlik, 1978; Shapiro, Hazeltine and Rowe, 1978; Epstein, 1973; Laws, 1973) have suggested that sponsored mobility is a form quite familiar to American higher education as well.

Incorporated within sponsored mobility is the notion that an individual's advancement to positions of significant power and authority is dependent upon a system of selection and guidance in which senior individuals superior in position and experience identify, educate and promote their juniors into positions as leaders and executives. These positions are usually ones the superiors themselves once held or others like them. It is, in short, an informal but highly powerful selection system for elite positions. The superiors are frequently referred to as mentors or sponsors. Thus the second question in our study was: Has the professional socialization of top women administrators differed from men? More specifically, because mentorship is considered an important means by which men are socialized and moved along career ladders, do women report a similar experience of mentoring?

In the desire to assist women in their second struggle in higher education, a good number of suggestions have been made, and individual programs have been created that build on the idea of sponsored mobility in academia. Kaye and Steele (1975) were able to identify over sixty programs to develop women's leadership potential for higher education. Among the programs were ones with national visibility including the ACE's National Women's Identification Program, the Claremont Women Administrators Program and The Higher Education Referral Service. For the most part, these programs are based on a similar set of assumptions about where women are and what is needed to get them into top-level positions in higher education.

The study we conducted was designed to bring additional information to bear on the processes by which women and men administrators are presumed to develop careers in higher education. As with most exploratory studies, however, the answers provoked more questions than they solved.

PROCEDURE

A standardized questionnaire of 24 items was developed and pilot-tested in the fall of 1978. It was designed to secure basic demographic data and to begin to explore aspects of the two questions articulated above concerning career patterns and socialization of college administrators.

The sample of 180 women administrators was selected from the data base compiled by The Pennsylvania State University Center for the Study of Higher Education and the Pennsylvania Planning Committee for the A.C.E. National Identification Program for the Advancement of Women in Higher Education Administration. The data were collected in two phases: First phase: In November 1978, 65 women (identified from the data base) who participated in the First Pennsylvania Conference for Women Administrators received the

questionnaire entitled, "Top Level Administrator Study," during the meeting. Accompanying the survey was a letter explaining the purpose of the study and requesting cooperation. Participants were asked to complete and return the questionnaire at the Conference or by mail. Each participant received a reminder postcard. Second phase: In January 1979, an additional 115 women administrators were mailed a similar questionnaire and letter. During February 1979, non-respondents were mailed a reminder postcard. The combined group of 65 Conference participants and 115 second phase subjects comprise the sample of women in Pennsylvania who occupy positions in the three administrative categories surveyed: major academic, middle academic and major support administrators. As of March 5, 1979 89 usable questionnaires were received constituting a 52 percent rate of return. Eight questionnaires were returned unanswered because the person had moved or was not in an appropriate position or--a sign of the times--because the college had closed. Data were coded and analyses were conducted utilizing the Statistical Analysis System computer program.

The response rate was compared for representativeness by institutional type. For purposes of this study, four institutions in Pennsylvania were identified as major research universities. This categorization was based on the Carnegie Commission classification of research universities I and II. The public four-year and two-year college category included 14 state colleges, 14 community colleges, and one state-related university. The private four-year and two-year college category included 83 private four-year colleges and universities and 10 private junior colleges. Analysis of the returns indicated only slight differences in the proportion of responses by institutional type.

In the major research universities 32 or 56.1 percent responded. For public colleges and universities 19 or 52.7 percent returned questionnaires. In the private colleges and universities 38 or 48.1 percent responded for a total of 89. As a result of the comparison, we considered our sample to be representative by institutional type.

Career-Line Classification

For purposes of this study individuals were classified according to the type of position they currently hold. We designated three different categories. First, major academic, which includes the positions of vice-president for academic affairs, chief academic officer or academic dean. This category does not include vice-presidents of business and other auxillilary operations. Presidents were also excluded for several reasons, in particular the special character of the selection process and of the position itself. Thus the major academic category is skewed toward deans. The second category is middle academic, which includes positions such as associate and assistant dean or director and assistant to the president. The third is major support, which includes student services positions such as chief student life officer, and dean of students and directors of auxilliary operations such as chief financial officer and director of public relations. A separate category was created for the support services including student affairs based on findings from previous research that have suggested it may be a separate career line (Mattfeld, 1972). It must also be noted that some positions in the major support category are equivalent in terms of responsibility, authority and other criteria, to those in both other categories. Thus the categories do not imply a hierarchy of levels necessarily.

There are a number of difficulties in doing research based on occupational titles and categories. First is the problem of classifying similar

but not exact titles. Second is the problem of same title but real differences in terms of size and mission of the institution. The responsibilities and authority for any given position such as dean or assistant director vary a great deal from institution to institution. Some assistant positions at large institutions have a scope of responsibility larger than some deans have at other institutions. This variation must be constantly kept in mind in considering the information presented below. According to our classification by level of position, women were rather evenly represented across categories. There were 40.6 percent in the major academic category, 29.2 percent in middle academic, and 30.3 percent in major support positions. However, as Table 1 shows the women tend to hold different positions in different types of institutions. The majority of women in the major academic category (52.6 percent) are located in private four-year and two-year colleges and universities which reflects the national profile of women in higher education (Howard, 1978).

FINDINGS

Background Characteristics

The background characteristics discussed below are age, marital status and education. These were selected as being particularly relevant to the questions under study.

Age. As might be anticipated the major academic administrators were slightly older on the average than were women in the other two categories. The average age for major academic 48.5 years; for middle academics, 42.7 years, and 84 percent for major support, 43 years. The range in ages was from 27 years to 65 years. The major academic category showed the least deviation from the mean.

Marital Status. There is considerable debate in the literature concern- the behaviors and experiences of academic women based on their marital status. Overall, the respondents were nearly equally divided between single and married, but as Table 2 indicates, there were divergences by position type. In addition, we have delineated those women who are members of religious communities. Religious women also were analyzed separately on other items in order to determine if they appeared to have experienced particular differences in their careers. These findings will be discussed below.

Education. Data regarding the nature and kind of collegiate education of each respondent were collected. Table 3 reports the information relevant to the number of earned doctorates and the primary field of highest degree (masters and doctorate). With regard to the number of earned doctorates, there is a considerable difference in the percentages among the three career categories, with 75.0 percent of the major academic category holding doctorates; 61.5 percent of the middle academics, and 51.8 percent of the major support group. The discrepancies are probably the result of a number of factors including the qualifications necessary for positions in each category. For instance, it is unlikely that an academic dean would not have the doctorate, while it would not be necessary for many assistant or associate positions. Age is another factor. Some of the younger women, especially in categories other than the major academic, currently are working on doctorate degrees.

When considering the primary field of the highest degree it becomes clear that the Pennsylvania sample reflects the national norm in terms of clustering in traditionally women's fields including education, humanities, and social sciences. It is interesting to note that those in major academic positions are more dispersed across all fields of study. Many women

administrators who earned doctorates in education did their bachelors and masters work in a discipline. They often continued the disciplinary specialization as their content field in doing the doctorate in education.

Dimensions of Mobility

A major focus of the study was to determine the mobility patterns of women administrators where mobility was conceived as a multi-dimensional concept. The traditional career mobility literature focuses first on positions held, then on institutions where the person was affiliated and perhaps finally, a mobility measure based on "distance" from background origins. For purposes of this paper, we have focused on the two types of mobility having to do with position and institution.

In considering the nature of the respondents' incumbency, we looked at two dimensions, time in position and whether they came to the position from within or outside the institution in which they hold their current position. When considering moves from outside the institution, we looked at whether the move was within the state, but other measures could be applied including mobility within the same type of institution.

Time in Current Position. One potential measure of whether or not affirmative action programs are having an effect relates to when women were promoted. We calculated that a reasonable date for taking affirmative action into account was 1972, 6 years ago. The number of years each respondent had spent in her current position were coded as a dichotomous variable; those with six years or less and those with more than six years. As Table 4 indicates, a large majority of women in all categories had been in their current positions six years or less. For major academic administrators, the

average was 4.1 years; for middle academic, 3.3 years, and for major support, 4.2 years. It was anticipated that the time in position would be shortest in categories such as support services where there is a higher turnover rate and longest at the top where terms of office are often specified as 5 or 10 years or longer. But because the literature suggests women remain longer in one position than men do we did not expect the average to be quite so low. Our data suggest that most of the women are recent appointees. More analysis will be required to determine whether and how affirmative action made a difference, but the implication is present.

Institutional Mobility. As noted above, we considered two types of institutional mobility, within the same institution and from other institutions in Pennsylvania. A majority (67 percent) of all women administrators had advanced to their current position from within the same institution. Moreover major academic administrators were more likely than any other category to have moved to their current position from within the same institution. This indication of institutional stability is further supported when the latest three positions are considered. Here the deep stability of major academic women is even more emphasized with over half (55.5 percent) having been at the same institution for their two previous positions. Higher institutional mobility is shown by the middle academics perhaps reflecting the mixture of skills and credentials they possess. In addition, some members of this group entered their current position immediately upon completion of an advanced degree.

These findings are in accord with most other research on academic women. However, continuous affiliation with one institution often has been considered a major liability or barrier to women administrator's ability to move up.

Comparable data on male administrators, particularly presidents, indicate they also possess a high degree of single institutional stability.

When considering the mobility of women administrators within the state, the results are a bit surprising. Only two respondents assumed their current positions by moving from another institution in Pennsylvania. Which says that if they weren't promoted from within for their current position, they came from out of state or from a position outside of higher education. Here again, nearly three-fourths of the respondents (73 percent) held their last three positions within the state. There is apparently very little circulation of women administrators within the state and not very much from out-of-state.

It seems clear there is little intra- or inter-state networking going on among institutions. At least when it comes to women administrators, they are hired from within the institution or in rare cases, out-of-state, but not from other Pennsylvania colleges.

Anticipated Mobility. When the respondents were asked whether or not they anticipated a move to another position within the next five years (See Table 5), 40 percent of the sample answered yes, 40 percent said no and 20 percent were uncertain. The middle academic group was the most likely to anticipate a move (53.8 percent) and the major academic was the least likely (29.4 percent). The response by the latter group is probably attributable to a number of factors but age may be a principal one; the average age for major academic administrators is 48.5 years, but several are in their sixties. Also, although there were no presidents in the group, some may feel they have attained the peak of their careers or that while they might consider a move, they may feel confined to one institution. In

the case of the women who are members of religious communities, the decision to move may not be theirs to make in the same way as it is for others. Finally, most of these women have held their present position less than six years so they may feel it is premature to speculate on the next move. One additional thought with regard to anticipated mobility is that if the most senior women administrators do not move, theirs will not be the specific positions to which other women can succeed in the near future.

The women who anticipated a move were asked to designate whether they expected to advance within their same institution or another. As Table 6 indicates the major academic women who expected to move were divided equally between those two categories, while women in the other two categories felt they would be slightly more likely to move to another institution. In addition, several women in the latter two categories felt their next move would be to leave higher education altogether.

Faculty Experience

In most research on top level men administrators, especially in academic affairs, advancement to their positions is through academic lines, often but not invariably including the chairmanship of an academic department. We were interested to learn how many of the women administrators in our sample had such experience.

As Table 7 indicates, the majority of respondents (53.9 percent) had held a full-time faculty position at some time. The major academic administrators were most likely to have had such experience while major support administrators were least likely to have been faculty. Doubtless a good deal of the variance is explainable by the nature of the jobs each category includes.

With regard to chairperson positions the evidence is much weaker. Only 14.6 percent of the respondents had been a chairperson, and even among the major academic administrators, 80 percent of whom had faculty experience, only 28 percent had ever held a department chair. Thus while it is clear that advancement to top-level positions for women as for men is through academic lines, the department head position appears not to be as important or as accessible to women as to men.

The one exception to this pattern of faculty experience is found in community colleges where other skills and experiences may be valued as highly as teaching and research. Differences in faculty experience did appear when controlled by institutional type. For instance when the women in two-year colleges were excluded in the category of women holding major academic positions, the proportion who had held faculty appointments was boosted to 97 percent. Nineteen (56 percent) of the 34 women in this four-year institution group advanced directly from teaching positions to top-line positions; 6 (18 percent) advanced from the position of chairperson, and 9 (26 percent) held another position in academic administration such as dean, associate or assistant dean.

Additional information on the careers of the 34 major academic administrators from four-year institutions in our study deserve mention. For example, there is frequent speculation in discussion of women's academic careers whether having had experience or having begun work in a support area, specifically student personnel, is detrimental to advancement to top positions. The data on the major academic respondents indicated that there is some merit to this speculation. Only two of the 34 major academic four-year college administrators had held support services positions.

Another speculation relating to women's careers suggests that women are still clustered in traditional fields such as teaching or nursing. This was borne out by the respondents. Of the major academic administrators, including those from two-year institutions, 33.3 percent had held positions in K-12 education, and another 8.3 percent had held health-related positions outside of higher education. At the least, this suggests delayed entrance into the academic ranks and/or a probable higher age differential between them and most males in comparable positions who began their careers directly in higher education. However, research by Cohen and March (1974) and others shows that a large proportion of college presidents had K-12 educational experience or ministerial backgrounds so that the women's backgrounds do not seem so disparate in this light.

Only four of the major academic administrators have had a classic, straight-through, academic career form B.A. through Ph.D to faculty position to administration. Of this group, two began in one of the "Seven Sisters" women's colleges, one was an undergraduate in a private, selective liberal arts college, all three received graduate training at private research universities. The fourth individual was a member of a religious community and attended prestigious Catholic institutions for all her academic training.

The analysis of these various factors in the career histories of the women administrators, especially those holding major academic positions is suggestive of several avenues for further research. For instance, these data suggest that no single career ladder predominates, nor is any single position such as department chairperson likely to be a better launchpad to top positions. However, faculty experience does

seem to be a prerequisite for most major academic positions.

Mentors

The attempt to discover what sorts of people had been influential in the course of the individual respondent's career was more complicated than we envisioned. The term mentor has many meanings, so it was necessary to specify in our question what we meant by the term but still allow opportunity for the respondents to indicate their actual experience. It is possible our definition skewed the responses more toward job-related persons. It is also true that by using the term mentor the question did not elicit responses related to the different kinds of sponsoring relationships individuals had experienced. Thus it is important to know how our questions were phrased:

> The term mentor refers to an individual who facilitates career advancement by "teaching the ropes," coaching, serving as a role model, and making important introductions.
>
> Have you had a mentor during your career thus far?___Yes___No
> a) What sex was this person?___Male___Female
> b) Describe briefly (1) how you came to know this person, (2) role of your mentor, and (3) how and when your mentor has been influential in your career?

The literature suggests that mentors often are such persons as a faculty member with whom the person worked closely (e.g., an advisor or thesis director), a direct job supervisor or superior (Shapiro, et al. 1978). Thus, we expected that those women with the most academic experience and typically the longest careers would have had mentors. Other literature suggests that mentors are often most important in assisting their proteges to attain the highest levels (Jennings, 1971; Epstein, 1973). Finally, we expected the majority of mentors would be male. However, as Table 8

indicates these expectations were not always confirmed.

The most surprising data came from women in major academic positions. These were the least likely to say they had mentors. By all indications, however, they had "greater opportunity" to have had mentors than did the other two groups. The major academic administrators had more academic experience, including doctorates and faculty experience, and longer careers, but slightly under two-thirds (61.8 percent) said they had not had mentors. The other two groups were divided approximately evenly between those who had mentors and those who did not.

A partial explanation for the lack of mentors may be provided by the answers given to a general question concerning significant, positive career influences. The majority of women in all three categories seemed to feel that having held a particular position was a key factor. Presumably what these women mean is that by virtue of holding a certain position and dong well in it, they built the foundation for their subsequent move(s). Thus they seem to credit the opportunity provided by position as equal or more important than the assistance of any individual.

With regard to sex of mentor the sample as a whole was split 50-50. Within categories, however, major academic administrators were more likely to have had women mentors, and major support administrators were more likely to have had men. There are doubtless several reasons for this including the fact that one fourth of the major academic group were members of religious communities for whom the opportunity to have a male mentor may have been more limited.

There were only one or two individuals who described a mentoring relationship that conformed to the class corporate model in which the

protege follows the mentor directly, often assuming the specific positions vacated by the mentor as the mentor's own career rises. The corporate model is predicated on a closed system within a fairly standardized hierarchy. Higher education, on the other hand, is a more open system with considerable position variety. Even within a given institution it is not always evident what is the next highest rung in the hierarchy. Thus in looking for a classic, corporate model mentor we would expect to find them in those parts of the higher education system that exemplified a more closed system. And indeed the two respondents whose descriptions most closely fitted the corporate model were members of religious communities.

We view these findings as exploratory in every respect. The present sample is too specific to permit generalizations beyond Pennsylvania. But these findings coupled with the anecdotal comments of several respondents indicate that at key points mentors or other types of sponsors have played a significant role in how and when the next stage of a career occurred. Thus for some women the mentor is a potent individual in their career. We clearly need more research on how and why this occurs.

CONCLUSION

This study of women administrators in one state we think speaks provocatively to the issues that surround the advancement of women in higher education generally. In certain respects it reiterates conditions and experiences we already knew concerning the small numbers of women in college administration and the narrow band of careers and institutional locations in which they are located.

With regard to mobility we considered several dimensions. We found that many women had changed positions quite recently, and this may be considered at least partially the product of affirmative action efforts. However, the great majority of women, single and married, have built their careers in one institution. There is little movement across the institutions in Pennsylvania and little from other states. Is this true for men in Pennsylvania? We do n t know yet.

So often the complaint is heard that there simply aren't qualified women out there, and, if they are, they won't move. Our data indicate otherwise. A fair percentage of women would be willing to move, in fact are anticipating a move. So one must ask, what can be done across the state and across institutions to improve opportunities for women to move if they choose?

In considering the women already in major academic positions, we find that they have generally conformed to the traditional academic model of career advancement. Most of them have been faculty members at one time, but few had ever headed a department. In fact, no single position emerged as one held in common by any career category.

Only about one third of the major academic respondents indicated that a mentor(s) was important to them in their career. Most of them said that the single most important influence in their advancement was the positions they held before their present position. However, when asked about barriers, many specified individuals. This is a provocative conjunction of findings that deserves more study. One possible interpretation is that these women felt individuals were more crucial in blocking them than helping them, and that most of all they felt their own effort and

experience benefitted them the most.

Another implication of these findings which bears on the strong faculty backgrounds of major academic administrators is that they do not resemble their colleagues in the other two categories. Almost no one among the major academic category had held a student personnel position. Few had held the same staff or line positions as do the present middle academic administrators. Part of the difference may relate to the nature of the work in each category as well as to the notion of separate career tracks. Another partial explanation may rest with the fact that the women currently at the top are older. They built their careers during a different period in higher education. Thus while we can learn much from their experiences, the transfer is not always direct. But perhaps more importantly, if the differences among the categories are borne out by subsequent research there is an implication that training programs geared to develop top level academic administrators but whose clientele are drawn from middle management and support positions, not faculty positions, are doing these women a disservice.

A similar question occurs when considering the rising level of discussion about mentors. If present top level women administrators discount the efficacy of mentors in favor of other things such as previous positions held and experiences gained, this ought to raise some doubts concerning the "reality" of programs built on the presumption that sponsors are crucial. At the least these conflicting ideas suggest that our conceptions about administrative career advancement at present are rather primitive. We simply do not know enough with enough exactitude to make generalizations that will apply across the spectrum of administrative careers.

Finally, both the differences in the representation of the three career lines among institutional types and the variations in career characteristics suggest a need for further study of organizational differences affecting advancement. Kanter's research (1976) (1976) on corporations indicates that structural conditions account for the relative disadvantage of many women with respect to power and opportunity. Her research offers a useful framework for studying higher education and may provide a parallel for the experiences of academic women.

The "second struggle" in which women admjnistrators are currently engaged is a multifaceted phenomenon. The study of women administrators in Pennsylvania parallels some research findings and contradicts others, but it does add to and elevate the debate on how women can build administrative careers, and how some of them are entering the executive level of educational/leadership and responsibility.

Table 1. Institutional Affiliation of Women Administrators by Career Category

Institutional Type	Major Academic N	Major Academic %	Middle Academic N	Middle Academic %	Major Support N	Major Support %	All Career Categories N	All Career Categories %
Public and Private Research Universities	10	31.2	14	43.8	8	25.0	32	36.0
Public 4-year and 2-year Colleges and Universities	6	31.6	3	15.8	10	52.6	19	21.3
Private 4-year and 2-year Colleges and Universities	20	52.6	9	23.7	9	23.7	38	42.7
All Institutions	36	40.4	26	29.2	27	30.3	89	100.0

Table 2. Marital Status of Women Administrators by Career Category

Marital Status	Major Academic		Middle Academic		Major Support		All Career Categories	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Single (Includes divorced and widowers)	15	30.7	9	34.6	13	48.2	37	41.6
Married	12	44.3	17	65.4	12	44.4	41	46.0
Member of Religious Community	9	25.0	0	0	2	7.4	11	12.4

Table 3. Selected Educational Characteristics of Women Administrators by Career Category

	Major Academic		Middle Academic		Major Support		All Career Categories	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Earned Doctorate	27	75.0	16	61.5	14	51.8	57	64.9
Primary field of most advanced degree*								
Education	11	30.0	6	23.0	17	63.0	34	38.2
Liberal Arts	9	25.0	5	19.2	3	11.1	17	19.1
Social Sciences	5	13.0	3	11.5	0	0	8	8.9
Physical and Biological Sciences	3	8.3	2	7.6	1	3.7	6	6.7
Nursing and Health	1	2.8	3	11.5	0	0	4	4.5
Business Administration	0	0	0	0	2	7.4	2	2.2
Library Science and Home Economics	3	8.3	1	3.8	1	3.7	5	5.6
Law/Medicine	0	0	1	3.8	1	3.7	1	1.1

*Percentages do not add up to 100 because a number of women hold a bachelors degree only.

Table 4. Selected Measures of Mobility of Women Administrators by Career Category

Mobility Measures	Major Academic		Middle Academic		Major Support		All Career Categories	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Six years or less in current position	27	75.0	24	92.3	22	81.4	73	82.0
Moved from within the same institution to current position	28	77.8	16	61.5	16	59.6	60	67.0
Moved from another Pennsylvania institution to current position	1	2.8	0	0	1	3.7	2	2.2
Last 3 positions in same institution	20	55.6	4	15.4	9	33.3	33	37.0
Last 3 positions within Pennsylvania institutions	32	88.9	15	57.7	18	66.6	65	73.0

Table 5. Anticipated Mobility of Women Administrators Within Next Five Years by Career Category

Anticipated Mobility	Major Academic N	Major Academic %	Middle Academic N	Middle Academic %	Major Support N	Major Support %	All Career Categories N	All Career Categories %
Expect to move within 5 years	10	29.4	14	53.8	11	40.7	35	40.2
Will not move	16	47.1	7	27.3	12	44.4	35	40.2
Uncertain	8	23.5	5	19.2	4	14.8	17	19.5
Total	34	100.0	26	100.0	27	100.0	87	100.0

Table 6. Anticipated Mobility of Women Administrators Within Same or Other Institution by Career Category

	Major Academic N	Major Academic %	Middle Academic N	Middle Academic %	Major Support N	Major Support %	All Career Categories N	All Career Categories %
Expect to advance in present institution	5	50.0	4	28.5	4	36.4	13	38.2
Expect to advance in other higher education institutions	5	50.0	7	50.0	6	54.5	18	52.8
Expect to leave higher education	0	0	3	21.4	1	9.0	3	9.0

*Figures are calculated on the basis of the responses to the first item in Table 5, expect to move within 5 years.

Table 7. Faculty Experience of Women Administrators by Carcer Category

	Major Academic		Middle Academic		Major Support		All Career Categories	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Full-time faculty Experience	29	80.0*	12	46.7	7	25.9	48	53.9
Chairperson Position	10	28.0	3	11.0	0	0	13	14.6

*Note - Includes those who entered faculty positions as a chairperson.

Table 8. Number of Women Administrators with Mentors by Career Category

Mentor	Major Academic N	%	Middle Academic N	%	Major Support N	%	All Career Categories N	%
Without Mentor	21	61.8	12	42.8	14	51.8	47	52.8
With Mentor	13	38.2	16	57.2	13	48.2	42	47.2
Female Mentor	8	61.5	8	50.0	5	38.4		
Male Mentor	4	38.5	5	31.2	8	61.5		
Both	1	7.6	3	18.7	0	0		
Total	34	100.0	28	100.0	27	100.0	89	100.0

References

Arter, M. H. The Role of Women in Administration in State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. (ERIC ED 080085) 1973.

Cohen, M. and March, J. G., Leadership and Ambiguity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1974.

Epstein, C. F. Woman's Place. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1970.

_____. Bringing Women In: Rewards, Punishments and the Structure of Achievement. Annals of New York Academy of Sciences, 1973, pp 62-70.

Howard, S. But We Will Persist. Washington, D. C. AAUW, 1978.

Jennings, E. Routes to the Executive Suite. NY: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Kanter, R. M. Men and Women of the Corporation. NY: Basic Books, Inc. 1976.

Kaye, B. & Scheele, A. Leadership Training. New Directions for Higher Education, 1970, 5 (10), 1-4.

Laws, J. L. Work Aspirations in Women: False Leads and New Starts. Signs: A Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 1976, 1 (3), 33-50.

Levinson, D. J. Growing Up With the Dream. Psychology Today, January, 1978, 70-89.

Mattfeld, J. Many Are Called, But Few Are Chosen. ACE National Conference Proceedings, 1972 (ERIC ED 071549).

Moore, K. M. and Wollitzer, P. A. Recent Trends in Research on Academic Women Faculty and Administrators. Paper presented at American Educational Research Conference, San Francisco, April, 1979.

Shapiro, E., Haseltine, F. P. & Rowe, M. P. Moving Up: Role Modes, Mentors and the Patron System. Sloan Management Review, 1978 19, (8), 51-58.

Touchton, J. and Shavlik, D. Challenging the Assumptions of Leadership: Women and Men of the Academy. New Directions for Higher Education, 1978, 22, 95-106.

Turner, R. Sponsored and Contest Mobility and the School System, American Sociological Review, 1960, 25, 855-867.

Wikler, N. J. The Second Struggle. Comment on Research/Action About Wo/Men, Washington, D.C., 10 (3) March 1978, 1-2.